





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Research Library, The Getty Research Institute

<http://archive.org/details/someobservations00brya>

SOME
OBSERVATIONS
UPON THE
VINDICATION OF HOMER,
AND OF THE
ANCIENT POETS AND HISTORIANS,
WHO HAVE RECORDED THE

SIEGE AND FALL OF TROY.

Written by I. B. S. MORRITT, Esq.

BY JACOB BRYANT.

Εγω δε πλεον ελπομαι
Λογον Οδυσσεος, η παθεν,
Δια τον αδυεπη γενεσθ' Ομηρον.
Επει ψευδεσσιν οι ποτανα γε μαχανα
Σεμνον επεσι τι. Σοφια δε
Κλεπτει παραγοισα μυθοις.

Pindar. Nemea. Z.

Ἡ τὸ Ὅμηρος σοφία κλεπτει τον νεν ἡμων, ὥς τα ψευδη δοκειν
αληθη ειναι δια χαριν και σεμνοτητα. Scholia.

E T O N:

PRINTED BY M. POTE, AND E. WILLIAMS.

MDCCXCIX.

Published by the same Author,

Observations upon the Miracles in Egypt, and the Divine
Mission of Moses.

The Sentiments of Philo Judeus concerning the Logos,
or Word of God.

THE P R E F A C E.

THE Author, of the Work, which I am about to consider, has given to it the title of A Vindication of Homer. It seems extraordinary, that he should have expended so much labour unnecessarily : for he has taken in hand to vindicate, where there was no grievance ; and to maintain what was never denied. Not one syllable is to be found in the Treatise, which he is pleased to oppose, that at all derogates from the character of the Poet : on the contrary, there appears every mark of the highest admiration. To this Vindication another is annexed of the Ancient Poets and Historians, who have recorded the siege and fall of Troy. Among these are Metrodorus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus,

A 2

Pausanias,

Pausanias, Plutarch: Of the Poets, Simonides, Euripides, Lucretius, Ovid: to whom others to a large amount might be added. These are all spoken of by me as Writers of consequence; and to their authority I continually appeal: nor can there be shewn an instance, in which they have been misrepresented. The Author therefore is again at unnecessary trouble to defend, where there is no censure, nor opposition. His zeal and humanity are needless; for he tries to justify, what was never disputed. At the same time it will be worth while, as we proceed, to observe his mode of Vindication; for I fear, that it will be sometimes found very little removed from abuse. But of this I shall say more hereafter.

AN
ANSWER
TO THE
VINDICATION, &c.

I N my Observations upon Mr. MORRITT's Vindication of Homer, I shall not professedly enter into any considerations concerning the War, with which it is connected: but only consider if his strictures are well founded and his conclusions just. He prefaces this Vindication with a remark, which is so abstruse and elaborate, that I am not sure, that I perfectly understand it. It begins in the following manner.

P. 1. *It is a misfortune attending on old, and established truths, that whilst they are received in the world, as matters of general notoriety, or undoubted authority, we are contented to take them upon trust: and, not irrationally, give credit to the opinions of those, who had better opportunities than ourselves to judge of their truth or falsehood.* Here is an unlucky circumstance mentioned, and it is not easy to find out in what it consists. We are told, that it is a misfortune attending upon old and established truths, that *they are taken upon trust.* But how can any ancient fact be taken otherwise? Whatever is not intuitively known,

must be received in this manner. It is farther added, that *We are contented to take them upon trust*. But this is a truth too plain to be mentioned. For we must necessarily be contented, where there is no choice. What adds to the misfortune is said to be, that *we, not irrationally, give credit to the opinions of those, who had better opportunities than ourselves to judge of their truth or falsehood*. There seems to me to be here, what we call, a paralogism: for how can it be a misfortune to act rationally: and to give credit to those, who are better informed? In short how can there be loss, or grievance, in admitting evidence upon *undoubted authority*? The Author says, that we are contented to give this assent: and well contented we may be: for what more can be desired than moral certainty? The Author adds, that Sceptics have appeared upon this subject before Mr B — *Sed omnes illacrymabiles urgentur, ignotique, longâ nocte jacent* (so it should be expressed.) To this I can only say, it is a pity that this mark of contempt was introduced so early; or that it was introduced at all. It is an unfortunate prelude.

P. 3. The Author of the Vindication says, that *he disclaims all ill will to Mr. B.* This would appear very liberal and fair, if he had not immediately subjoined, that *though there is an appearance of candor, yet he (Mr. B.) does not seem to have considered the affirmative with indifference*. Hence we find, that, notwithstanding this plausible appearance of candor, Mr. B. has but little share of it, and has viewed things with a very partial eye. After this come some very
severe

severe intimations. *The Reader will judge, whether his (Mr. B's.) statements are always perfectly fair. And, if he finds, that interpretations are given by him to classical passages, wholly unwarranted by the context; translations materially differing from their originals; and erroneous transcripts from the originals themselves; he will be apt to smile at the fervour of that zeal, which has stepped forward under the mask of inquiring for literary truth, to defend a favorite Egyptian system. The Author seems already greatly aggrieved, and betrays much disquietude: and, we fear, some intimations of more ill will than he owns.*

Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in faucibus Orci
 Luētus, et ultrices posuere cubilia Curæ.

He indeed sets out with only saying, that *the Reader should consider, and judge, whether the statements of Mr. B. are always perfectly fair.* This is mild and gentle; and like that calm which comes before a storm. But he is afterwards less moderate: and speaks of *passages wholly unwarranted, false translations, erroneous transcripts; and as we shall find in the course of the Treatise, wilful perversion of the truth.* So far from smiling at a mistaken zeal, the World must detest a man under such a mask, who is guilty of so much perfidy and baseness; who, whatever his parts may be, has prostituted them to so vile a purpose. But it is to be hoped, that we shall find things more favourable; and that the character of the person alluded to, will not be affected by these severe allegations. As to truth being sacrificed for a favourite Egyptian system, the insinuation is

disingenuous; and no such prejudice is to be found. It is very unworthy the person, from whom it proceeds. It is open to the Reader to judge, whether there be the least truth in this censure: and he may farther consider, whether he can here see, or whether he ever in his life saw,—*Fervour of Zeal under a mask of inquiry, stepping forward to maintain an Egyptian system.* It affords a strange and complex phenomenon, totally past my comprehension.

P. 4. Mr. B. is here charged with unfairness in his version of a passage in Justin Martyr. The Author accordingly says, *Justin is asserting the higher antiquity of Moses: and he does not say, that the Grecians had no history, upon which they could depend: but that they had none, which was accurately detailed, like the records of the Pentateuch.* But, when the Author brings this accusation, and charges both the version and application of the sentence with unfairness, (p. 5.) which is a severe censure; why does he not bring the original immediately before the eye of the Reader in the text, and afford himself a better version, and prove wherein Mr. B. has failed? The words of the learned Father are as follow. *Ἀλλως τε εἰς τοῦτο ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν προσηκεῖ, ὅτε εἶδεν Ἕλλησι πρὸ τῶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀκριβεὲς ἰστορηταί. Οὐδ' ἐστὶ τι συγγραμμικὸν παλαιὸν Ἑλλήνων ἢ Βαρβάρων σημαίνον πρᾶξιν.* Just. Mart. p. 16. A. *Besides you ought to be well apprised, that the Grecians have no history, upon which they can depend, antecedent to the Olympiads. They have no written evidence of any antiquity relating either to themselves or any other nation.* This is the true purport of the passage. How then
can

can the Author assert, *that Justin does not say, that the Grecians had no history on which they could depend*; when the words quoted are so plain? As to *the Pentateuch*, and *the records*, of *the Pentateuch* detailed, they are not included here: They are neither mentioned, nor referred to by Justin.

The Author of the Vindication, in treating of the War of Troy, (p. 5.) pronounces the grounds of this war to be adequate. By this, I presume, the Author means, that they afford a sufficient and probable reason for it. He gives a very short epitome of these grounds, which he endeavours to make plausible. *Paris, an Asiatic Prince, came to a Grecian Court, which he insulted by carrying off the Queen of the Country, and a quantity of treasure, and slaves, which were the property of her husband. In this plain history there is nothing incredible.* Undoubtedly nothing, when thus partially represented. But the Author has artfully omitted a number of articles, with which this history is accompanied. However, he says most truly, that *Mr. B. collecting together the miraculous stories related by different Greek Authors, (and he should have added by Homer himself) sees nothing on every side, but a mass of impenetrable fiction. The supernatural birth of Helen, the dreams of Hecuba, and the contest of the three Goddesses, are in his opinion so gross, as to impeach the credit of every part of the story.* The Author certainly speaks my mind: and I own, that I think, these fables are very gross, and that the credibility of the history is certainly injured by them; for they are the foundation, upon which that history is built.

But

But as the Author only hints at these extravagances, and does not choose to bring them before the eye of the Reader, it shall be my business, before I proceed farther, to place them in full view: at least such, as are most to the purpose.

The whole of the war depended upon Helen being stolen, and carried from Sparta by Paris. And as we have had of this Personage a very imperfect account given above, I shall beg leave to give a more ample history of him. He was the son of Priam by Hecuba, who when she was with child, of him, dreamed, that she was delivered of a burning torch. This was by the wise men of Troy interpreted, as a fatal prognostic: and they gave out, that the child would one day inflame his Country, and be the ruin of the nation. Upon this the Parents formed an unnatural resolution, that the child, when born, should be exposed to the wild beasts upon Mount Ida. He was accordingly carried, and exposed there. But some Shepherds found him: and he was through their compassion preserved. When he arrived at a state of manhood, he was one day accosted by the God Mercury, who came to his hovel, and presented him with a golden apple. At the same time he told him, that he was to bestow it as a prize upon the most beautiful of the three Goddesses, who attended for his determination. These three Deities were Juno, Pallas, and Venus; who immediately stript themselves before him, and he after a proper attention, adjudged the golden apple to Venus. The Goddess in return, promised that she would bestow upon him the most handsome

handsome woman in the world. After this he quitted his pastoral life; and leaving the Mountain he came to Troy. Here, by what means we know not, he was found out and acknowledged by his Parents: and from a Clown and Mountaineer became the finest Gentleman of the age.

Soon after this he built a fleet of Ships, the last thing that one would have expected, and though *commerce was not then known, and little communication subsisted between the Provinces*, as the Author, p. 6, and p. 8. observed: and though not the least reason is given for his going to Sparta, yet to Sparta he went with his fleet of ships. At that time Menelaus was King of that City, whose wife was the peerless Helen; whom Paris beguiled and carried off. One would imagine, that when he had stolen such a prize, with treasure to a great amount, that he would have made the best of his way homeward; and there secured himself. No: he took quite a different course; and carried his Lady to Egypt: and then after some time returned to Troy. Helen is said to have been the daughter of Leda, the wife of Tyndarus, with whom Jupiter had a private intercourse in the shape of a Swan. Hence her mother at a proper time was brought to bed of two eggs; and out of one of these Helen and a brother were hatched. When she was as yet very young she became greatly admired for her uncommon beauty, and Tyndarus, suspecting that she would be one day stolen, obliged all those, who made any pretensions, to swear, that they would unite their powers to bring her back. This shewed a wonderful forecast,

cast, and at the same time an uncommon affection in Tyndarus for a suppositious and spurious child. These however were the grounds of the Trojan War and the expedition of the Grecians.

We see, that the history of this war is founded upon the most idle and improbable stories, yet the Author of the Vindication insists, that the truth of this history is not hence at all impeached; and this we shall find repeated through his whole Treatise. But it is a mistake: for if the basis be bad, the building must be in danger. And whereas Euripides, and several Grecian Writers differ in some of these essential articles, the Author sets them aside, because they were Poets. But Homer was a Poet, and by the Author, p. 75, supposed to have been of Asia. A Native therefore of Hellas has as much reason to be credited about Helen and Sparta, as a person of the opposite continent. The Author would fain rid himself of these difficulties, and palliate the extravagances of the Poets. But it is impossible. The most idle fiction is in Homer himself, who makes the contest of the Goddesses, and the apple given to Venus, to have been the cause of the war. He speaks of Juno and Pallas as never forgiving it.

Ἀλλ' ἔχον, ὡς σφιν πρῶτον ἀπήχθετο Ἰλίου ἱρή,

Καὶ Πριαμος, καὶ λαὸς Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἑνὲς αἰτῆς.

Ὅς κτείσσε θεάς, ὅτε οἱ μετσαυλὸν ἵκοντο,

Τὴν δ' ἡγήσ', ἥ οἱ πορὲ μαχλοσυνὴν ἀλεγείνην. Ω. 27.

These articles cannot be cancelled; and if they are on the other hand admitted, the Jerusalem of Tasso, and the Orlando of Ariosto, have

have as good right to be believed. Clelia, Cassandra, and Amadis de Gaul have better pretensions.

The Author tries to excuse these legendary stories throughout his whole Treatise; but in these endeavours he cautiously avoids mentioning many facts, of which he ought to have taken notice. He alludes too partially to many incidents, instead of laying them properly before the Reader. He also omits many arguments and proofs, which are contained in the Treatise, which he opposes; and are there inserted to shew the incredibility of the war.

P. 9. He likewise tries to make the antecedent rape of Helen by Theseus plausible by the like omissions, and forms a history of it from Plutarch, which he so models, as to make it in some degree credible. But he does not take notice of one syllable, that makes against him. He says nothing about her being at that time represented as only seven years old; and her brothers no older, as they were from the same eggs. He forgets that his Author, Plutarch, confesses the obscurity of the times, and the uncertainty of this history; that he owns that Helen was not yet in a state of maturity; that according to some writers, she was not stolen by Theseus; but that it was Idas and Lynceus who carried her away. Plut. Theseus. p. 4. F. All this intelligence, and these contradictions, are passed over by the Author in silence.

The Author had mentioned, p. 7. *the powerful Leaders of Greece: their alliances, and the large confederacy formed at Aulis.* He mentions *Heroes, who asserted the cause of justice; and stood in the place of the Gods.* p. 8. Yet this was at a time, when by his own confession, *Agriculture was neglected, and commerce unknown,* p. 6. And he speaks of people at this day, who bear a strict resemblance to them, for *piracy is frequent among them, little communication between the Provinces; in short every characteristic of the early times, excepting their freedom and their honour.* p. 8. Thus we find honour and freedom supposed in these early times amidst confessed barbarism; and great and distant alliances formed, where there was little or no communication: alliances, that extended from Epirus to Rhodes, and from Rhodes to Thrace. p. 7. He farther admits, that in these *honourable days, the petty Chiefs were continually engaged in a freebooting warfare; and ready to assemble, where there was any prospect of plunder.* p. 7. 8. As to their freedom mentioned above, we can say little to it; as we never heard of it, unless it consisted in taking the liberty to rob their next neighbours. Of this freedom mention is often made in Homer. And none were more free, if this were freedom, than those Heroes, who are said *to have asserted the cause of justice, and stood in the place of the Gods.* The Poet describes them, as in a state of rapine before the war, and they all turned Pirates and Marauders afterwards. Strabo. L. 1. p. 83. Of this ample testimony was afforded: but the whole is passed over in silence; and a specious picture of honour is given, as existing in the most rude and barbarous times. But of this I shall say more hereafter.

P. 13. The Author of the Vindication proceeds in saying,--*It seems strange to Mr. B. that an army like that at Platea, should be thought an extraordinary exertion, at a time when Greece, abounded both in wealth and men; and yet that she should be able in the rude ages described by Thucydides, to levy and support so extraordinary an armament, as that under Agamemnon. But our astonishment will cease when we reflect that the barbarous, and uncivilised ages of the world have ever furnished armies whose numbers in civilised times are almost deemed fabulous. He accordingly mentions from Pausanias, that the army of Brennus amounted to 213200 effective men: and adds, The Cimbri and Teutones, whom Marius conquered, brought into the field against him 300000 effective men. The Gauls, who in the time of the Republic sacked and burnt the City of Rome, and the Huns, Goths, and Vandals of later times, assembled troops, which astonish almost to incredulity. The very circumstances of rudeness and barbarism, which form the ground work of Mr. B's argument, are in reality the proofs of its fidelity. In this argument, we fear, the Author is mistaken. It does not merely depend upon the numbers sent out; but upon the extent of country, where they were collected. Gaul and Germany were large and populous regions. Scandinavia was very extensive, and styled the Northern hive, whence vast colonies issued. And the Scythic region of the Huns we know to have been immense, though the precise extent cannot be determined. What was the Peloponnesus, with the addition of the small provinces above, to these? They bear no proportion. We must not therefore consider only the number of men specified; but the regions, from which they came.*

The least of these was many times larger than all Greece. The Author concludes. *If he (the Reader) candidly considers all this, I believe, he will hardly acquiesce in Mr. B's conclusion against the probability of the expedition.* We fear, if no better arguments are brought, the Reader will be forced to acquiesce.

P. 22. Mr. B. now starts another objection, for he asserts, that the *Shipping of the Grecians, must by a ten years anchorage, have been rendered totally unfit for service.* We should never strain the words of a Writer beyond their true purport. There is no mention made by Mr. B. of anchorage, nor were the ships at anchor, but drawn upon the beach. Nor does he assert; but says only, that one *would imagine.* But if he had spoken more determinately, how could he be blamed, when he is countenanced by the very words of the Poet?

Και δὴ δῆρα σέσηπε γειών, καὶ σπαρτα λελυγται.

The timbers are rotted, and the cordage has lost it's strength. These words the Author unduly suppresses and proceeds, we fear, in a course of argument too lax and inconclusive. He tells us, that Mount Ida abounded in timber, and adds, *Is it necessary to suppose, that the ships were never repaired, because they are never mentioned as undergoing the operation?---At the time, to which Agamemnon alludes the rigging might want repairing.* We suppose, before they sailed, it was repaired. p. 23. But why does he suppose, when there is not the least ground for supposition?

He

He argues from the silence of the Poet, when he speaks most plainly : and when he tells us, that in the tenth year, just before the conclusion of the war, the Ships were very much decayed. And there is no reason to think, as the Author does, that before they sailed, there was any repairing : for the contrary is manifest. In the *Odyssea* Nestor gives a full account of every material article, that followed, upon the destruction of the City. He says, that they immediately purposed to return. That they first called a Council, to which they came intoxicated, and dissensions ensued. They afterwards separated with much noise and tumult. He intimates farther, that Agamemnon wished to restrain the people in order to offer some propitiatory sacrifices ; but he was defeated in his purpose : for the greatest part immediately set sail, and he soon followed. *Odyss.* Γ. v. 130. There was therefore no time for repairing or rebuilding a thousand Ships.

The Author still proceeds, and says----*From the quotation which Mr. B. gives at the end of this Chapter, he infers that Menelaus used the same ships for eight years after the destruction of Troy.* It is very truly said, for it is so intimated by the Poet in his *Odyssea*.

Ἡ γὰρ πολλὰ πᾶθων, καὶ πολλὰ ἐπαλήθειαι

Ἡγαγομένην ἐν νηυσὶ, καὶ οὐδοατῶ εἶπεν ἡλθον. Δ. 81.

To this evidence the Author seems to us to make a strange reply.
p. 23. *Homer's words are ἐν νηυσὶ, in ships : and whether they were never repaired*

repaired or rebuilt is a subject, on which he is totally silent. Why then does the Author make any inference, when he acknowledges that the Poet says not one word to the purpose. Menelaus came with a fleet to Troy, and departed with it. How can we infer, that they were different ships, when no such intimation is afforded? In a note at the bottom of, p. 23. we are told, *In this passage, I can find not one word that proves, what Ships Menelaus possessed, or how they had been built, or how often repaired.* Why then does he, when he can find no intimation, make any supposition and venture upon conjecture unsupported? He is still unwilling to give up the point, and, p. 24. says, *There are many seaboats in England whose duration has been greater than that of any of their (the Grecians) ships.* Here is only half the truth said; the rest is not duly suppressed. There may be, what he calls seaboats, as old as Drake's ship was at Deptford. But are there any such, which want no repairs; and, which after seventeen, or even ten, years, are fit for service? We cannot but hesitate about the propriety of this assertion.

P. 24. The Author here says—*We now come to another argument drawn also chiefly from the silence of Homer. We do not find, it is true, any mention of a regular correspondence, which was owing to the circumstances of the times; but, that there was no intercourse at all, cannot be inferred from Homer's not having recorded it.* It has been shewn by Mr. B. that such an inference may be fairly made; and the arguments, which the Author must have read, were not drawn merely from

from the silence of the Poet, but from what he has more than once very plainly signified. The very line quoted by the Author from Mr. B. shews that there had been no correspondence. Ζῶειν μὲν εἰσὶ φασὶ Μενoitιον. Iliad. II. v. 14. *They say, that Menætiüs is still alive.* By this we find, that there was a vague report, consequently very uncertain. Had any intelligence been brought to Achilles himself, from his Father, or Friends in Thessaly, he would have spoken with more certainty. He afterwards plainly shews, that he knew nothing about his Father: for he says that he is absolutely in doubt, whether Peleus was living, or departed.

Ἡδὴ γὰρ Πηληγὰ γ' οἶμαι ἢ κατὰ παμπαν

Τέθναναι, ἢ ὥς τυτθὸν εἰ ζῶντ' ἀπαχθῆσθαι. T. v. 334.

For I should think, that my Father Peleus is either absolutely dead; or barely alive, and under the last afflictions of old age. He appears equally uncertain about the fate of his Son, whom he left in the Island Scyros I know not, he says,

Εἶπε εἰτι Ζῶει γέ Νεοπτολεμος θεσσιδης.

Now Scyros, according to the Poet, could not be above two days and a half sail from the coast of Troas. Even Thessaly was not much farther; for Achilles says, that he could reach it in three days. II. I. v. 363. Scyros lay nearly in the way for any ships, that passed or repassed, to bring intelligence from Greece. Yet no intelligence seems to have been obtained during the whole time (above nine years))

years) that the army was before Troy. This has been urged: and every body must confess, that this is not arguing from silence. It is a fair inference made from the very words of the Poet. And all these words have been before quoted: and these proofs have been brought in full view for the Reader's inspection. But by the Author they are sometimes extenuated; and sometimes totally neglected. And he renews his objections to articles, which have been sufficiently ascertained, as if nothing had been previously said. And we are sorry to say, that this is attended with too much contempt.

P. 24. It had been said, that no intimation is given of any fresh troops being sent to the army before Troy. Upon which he observes.—*The other objection of their (the Grecians) not being recruited is equally founded on Homer's silence* And surely it is not founded amiss: for how can we believe a fact, that is not once mentioned, and where there is constant intimation to the contrary? The Author of the Vindication still proceeds, and says,----*We read however of the recruits brought afterwards by Pyrrhus; and allowing the argument in its fullest extent, it will only prove that the army must have been greatly weakened before the tenth year.* Why then did they not send for recruits before that year? and what reason have we to think, that even then they sent for them? If the Author has any account of fresh troops brought by Pyrrhus, (for we recollect none) he should mention his authority for it. But he seems to suspect the evidence And whilst he dwells so much upon the silence of Homer, he forgets, what the Poet really has

has said: to which he ought to have attended. Homer speaks very plainly upon this subject; and informs us, that Pyrrhus was concealed in the Island Scyrus; a place of no great extent, which could not have furnished any supply of consequence, nor did it supply any at all. Ulysses tells Achilles in a discourse with him, that he can give him a very good account of his son Neoptolemus, called also Pyrrhus.

Αὐτὸς γὰρ μιν ἐγὼ κοίλῃς ἐπὶ νηὸς εἰσῆς

Ἠγαγον ἐκ Σκυροῦ μετ' εὐκνημίδας Ἀχαιοί. *Odyss. A. v. 507.*

We find, he was fetched from Σκυρος, or Scyros, and brought in a single ship, which had before its complement. What recruits could he bring? None certainly, as is plain from the Poet's words. This is not arguing from silence. The truth is not founded upon what was not said: but upon Homer's clear and positive evidence, with which it is a pity, that the Author was not better acquainted. We are obliged in justice to say so much, and at the same time to warn him of any blind attachment: for we find him at the close saying, that *Troy at last fell only by a well timed stratagem*. From this it appears, that he gives credit to the story of the wooden horse; a fiction, the most idle that ever was devised.

It had been observed in the Treatise, which the Author of the Vindication controverts, that Homer shews great precaution in respect to the Fortification, which the Grecians were said by him to have erected for the security of their Camp, and Fleet. It consisted of a

wall and rampart, with a deep ditch on the outer side; all which was constructed during the secession of Achilles. *Iliad*. H. v. 435. The Poet was sensible, that such a mound of earth was durable: and if it ever had existed, people in after times would expect to have found it, and the credibility of his narration depended upon its appearance. The Poet therefore to remedy this deficiency, and to take off any untoward arguments from its not existing afterwards, says, that it was demolished by some of the Gods. They brought all the neighbouring rivers to bear upon it. Jupiter also rained from heaven for nine days; and Neptune assisted. By these means this great work was borne down into the sea. Hence Mr. B. concludes, that the whole history of the rampart is a fable. And he forms his opinion from many inconsistent circumstances, which are omitted by the Author, who represents the rampart and ditch as inconsiderable: the work of one day. p. 28. The history of this operation is thus described by the Poet. H. v. 385. The Trojans petitioned for a truce, that they might bury their dead, which was granted. They accordingly went to Ida to cut wood, and the Grecians took the opportunity of going to the same place with the like view. After this they formed their funeral piles, and performed the last rites. This was their mode of proceeding. The Author thinks, that this was compleated in a single day; and hence concludes, that the foss and rampart were finished in the same short interval. This we suspect to be a mistake: for the operations seem to have required a much longer time. This, we think

think, appears afterwards from the petition of Priam to Achilles. In this he mentions that Ida, whence they were to fetch wood was a great way from the City. Οἷσθα γὰρ ὡς πατὰ αὖτις ἐλμεθα, τηλοθὶ δ' ὕλη. Ἀξέμεν ἐξ ὁρέος. Ω. v. 663. He therefore begs a truce of no less than eleven days to bury his dead, and to raise a tomb to Hector. If the distance of Ida from Troy was great; it must have been far more considerable from the Grecian camp: which, if we believe Mr. Chevalier, was at least ten miles from Troy. The funeral rites therefore, and the construction of the foss and rampart, took up a much longer space. The Poet therefore, when he mentions the particular time, when these operations were carrying on, speaks only of the parts of the civil day, in which the people were occupied. They got wood as early as they could: and burnt, and buried their dead at night; afterwards----Ἡμὸς δ' ἔτ' ἀρ' ὦρα ἦως, ἐτι δ' ἀμφιλυκὴ νύξ, the next morning, *when it was not yet quite day-light, but still doubtful night*; they returned to the place of sepulture, and raised a tomb over them. ---Τυμβὸν---ἑνὰ ποιεῖον. Η. v. 435. This, we think, proves, that there was more than one day allotted for the performance of these duties. After this the Poet informs us, that they built the rampart, and the other necessary works: but in what time is not mentioned. We can only make an estimate from the nature and extent of the works, which appear to have been very considerable.

Τημὸς ἀρ' ἀμφὶ πύργῳ κριτὸς ἐγγετο λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν..

Τυμβὸν δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὴν ἑνὰ ποιεῖον, ἐξαγαγοντες:

Ακριτον εκ πωιδις· ποτι δ' αυτον τειχος εδειμαν,
 Πυργος θ' ὑψηλος, ειλαρ νηων τε και αυτων.
 Εν δ' αυτοισι πυλας ενεποιεον ευ αραιιας,
 Οφρα δι' αυτων ἱππηλασιη ὁδος ειη.
 Εκτοσθεν δε βαθειαν επ' αυτω ταφρον ορυζαν,
 Ευρειαν, μεγαλην· εν δε σκολοπας καταπηζαν. H. v. 434.

We will now present the Reader with Mr. Pope's Version,

Then to secure the Camp, and naval Powers,
 They raised embattled Walls with lofty Towers,
 From space to space were ample gates around,
 For passing chariots; and a trench profound,
 Of large extent; and deep in earth below
 Strong piles infix'd stood adverse to the foe.
 So toil'd the Greeks.—See Homer H. v. 435.

Mr. Pope affords no bad imitation of the original, and we may see from him, that this was no contemptible work. But the Author of the Vindication speaks of it as a very humble performance; which (p. 28.) he proves in the following manner. *Of the size of each of them* (the foss and rampart) *we shall there* (in the 12th. Book,) *find a very sufficient intimation. When the Trojans came to it they stopped, for says he, it was not easy to leap over it; and there was a difficulty in passing through it, since the sides were very steep; and the upper part fenced with palisadoes.* We fear, there were other obstacles; for there seem to have been also palisadoes below in the ditch---Ταφρον ορυζαν---εν δε σκολοπας καταπηζαν. Yet notwithstanding these difficulties, which

he

he so plainly allows, he tells us in the next line, that *Hector actually leaped over the foss*. How the Author could possibly be led into this mistake, we cannot imagine. For Homer tells us, that the Hero went over the causeway, which was made for *ἰππηλασία*, a passage for chariots and horses, and consequently for the foot also, to pass over, when they took the field; and that he seized a vast stone, and went up to the gate of the opposite tower, which with a violent shock he burst open, and then sprang in. The Author should consider that there is a great difference between going under a building, and jumping over a rampart. He thinks otherwise, and says, p. 28.-----*ditch, rampart and palisades were within the compass of a desperate leap*. A very desperate leap it must have been: yet he persists, and affirms that Patroclus leaped over them all. And he shews the certainty of it by the following estimation in the same page. *The size of the wall we may discover also from another part of the same book, where we find Sarpedon approaches it, and seizing the battlement with a strong hand, drags it down. It falls, and a breach is made in the wall*. But this does not prove that Patroclus leaped over it. Besides we suspect that there is another mistake: for there was no breach at this time made. Sarpedon pulled down one of the *παλῆς*, or *pinnæ murorum*, one of the battlements; but the wall remained, though deprived of this defence---*Τείχος ἐγυμνωθή*, are the Poet's words M. 399. He proceeds in his argument, *The height of it, we see, was little more than that of a man*. We will then, without entering into too nice an inquiry, grant, that it may have been six feet,

or six feet and a half high; and we will not dispute the breadth: still this is a great height for a person armed, however strong and active, to have vaulted over. Besides Patroclus was in a chariot with three horses and a charioteer. IL. II. 149, and 467. and with all these he must have gone over the rampart and ditch. And this ditch the Poet describes, as *ευρειαν, μεγαλην, βαθειαν, μεγα εργον*. H. 440, 441, 444. And the piles or palisadoes----*πυκνης και μεγαλης*. The Author therefore of the Vindication, must have been misled by some bad version, to which he applied: for there is nothing in the Poet concerning either Hector or Patroclus leaping; nor was it possible.

The history is as follow, The Trojans, after they had forced their way into the Grecian Camp, made a passage in more than one place through the rampart, and by these openings they afterwards retreated.. Patroclus pursued.

Αντικρυ δ' ανα ταφρον υπερθρον ωκειες ιπποι,

Αμβροτοι, ες Πηληϊΐθιοι δσαν αγλαα δωρα,

Προσσω ιεμενοι. II. v. 380..

The immortal Coursers, which the Gods had given as a noble present to his father Peleus, bounded through the trench, αντικρυ, quite through to the opposite side, continually pressing forwards. In this trench lay heaps of warriors slain, with their chariots overturned. II. v. 378. The verb θορω does not necessarily signify to leap over, but to prance and bound: which may be effected upon plain ground.

The

The Author has so mean an opinion of the rampart that he thinks, it might without any great difficulty have been destroyed. *It was easily to be obliterated.* p. 27. Why then was the labour of the Gods introduced, and the combination of so many rivers mentioned in order to have it demolished? It is observed in the Treatise concerning Troy, that some of these rivers must have gone retrograde just as they are by Ovid mentioned in a poetical rant.

Xanthe, retro propera, versæque recurrite Lymphæ.

The Author thinks, that this may have happened: for he says----
All these rivers however flow into the Propontis or Hellespont above the Rhætean, they may perhaps by Homer be represented as co-operating with the Scamander in causing an inundation at its mouth. p. 29. There is no occasion to mention *perhaps*. They are plainly represented by the Poet, as joining the Scamander, and making *an inundation at its mouth*. And this junction, and this cooperation, is as contrary to truth and common sense, as to suppose the Severn, Trent, and Humber, making an inundation at the mouth of the Thames. These and many other wonderful articles are either believed or palliated by the Author; for he says, who can suppose, *that Homer would violate probability?* (p. 22.) Yet he has violated probability in numberless instances, as Milton and many other Poets have done since. The Author's great zeal, we fear, prevents his making a proper distinction. A Poet's excellence is not diminished in the eye of the world by his introducing feigned occurrences, or the *speciosa miracula* mentioned by Horace. They
are

are often received with the greatest admiration. A battle piece by Raphael, or a landscape designed by Poussin or by Gainsborough, are not esteemed the less because they never existed.

-----Pictoribus atque Poetis

Quidlibet audendi semper fuit æqua potestas.

It had been said, that Homer was instructed by Phantasia, a woman of Memphis: and it is conjectured, that she was a Priestess of Isis. Upon which the Author observes, that *every Lexicon will inform us, that Phantasia, Φαντασία, is a Greek word, derived from φαίω.* But every person of common sense should know, that an ancient Egyptian name could not be of Grecian original, however modified by the Greeks. It was farther said, that Phant and Phont signified at this day a Priestess. To this likewise the Author objects, and says, *Mr. B. diving into all the depths of Coptic lore, finds the word Hant and Hont to be a priest, then by a national prefix forms it into P'Hant.* p. 33. This is very true: and it has the sanction of the learned La Croze, Jablonsky, Kircher, Scholtz, and Woide. This may be new to him; but why does he suppose people ignorant, because he does not know? For every article upon this subject numberless vouchers and proofs are brought, which are set aside unnoticed.

P. 25. The Author of the Vindication seems to be in a continual ferment, and to be dissatisfied with every thing, that is said. In the Treatise upon Troy it had been observed, that there was such a City
in

in Egypt, which was mentioned both by Strabo and by Stephanus Byzantinus. And from their authority the description of it was taken. But in the translation of the several passages great offence has been given. The Author of the Vindication, p. 35. summons the Reader to take particular notice, and says—*I would wish to fix the attention of the Reader upon the manner in which he (Mr. B.) has amplified this interesting discovery. He quotes the passage from Strabo, and sets out in his translation of it by making Troy in Egypt a Town which in the original is κωμη a village.* The words of Mr. B. in the version alluded to are, *There was a Town or Village-----which Town was named Troy.* Does not the Author know, that the word κωμη signified both a Village, and a Town? Does he not farther know, that it is sometimes applied even to a City? That it signifies a Town we learn from Luke the ix. v. 6. The words διερχοντο κατα τας κωμας are there rendered---*They went through the Towns*, also v. 12. τας κυκλω κωμας is translated *in the towns round about.* And that it must sometimes have a reference to a City may be known from the word κωμοπολις, Mark i. 38. The persons, who gave the interpretations above were, we believe, men equal in learning to the Author. The learned Albertus in his notes to Hesychius mentions from a Lexicon---κωμαι, αι βραχυστατοις πολεις. The word therefore did not, as has been wrongly supposed, always signify a village. It is farther said (Joshua x. v. 37.) both in the original, and English version, that Joshua smote all their cities: this by the Seventy is rendered πασας τας κωμας. In Jeremiah, 49. v. 25

there is mention made *of the City of praise*: this like the former is rendered *κωμη*. Strabo himself calls the city in Egypt *Φρξριον ερυμνον*, a *garrison of strength*, which cannot signify a Village. The persons, who have thus rendered this word, were Grecians: and we conceive, that their authority cannot well be disputed. Numberless instances to this purpose may be seen in the Greek Version of the Bible.

P. 35, 36. The Author continues his animadversions, and says, *In the next page Mr. B. calls it (Troy) a city in Arabia: then proves it such by a quotation from Stephanus.* It is of no great consequence: but the fact is stated wrongly. Mr. B. does not affirm first, and bring the authority afterwards: but applies at once to the Greek Author mentioned. He adds-----*It may be observed, that we have here no translation: but in fact the quotation will not bear this construction. The words of it are,—There is also a Troy in Egypt.* The truth is, that the principal word has been by an oversight omitted: and had the Author consulted the original, he would have found *πολις* there expressed. The true reading is----*Εστὶ καὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτου πολις (Τροια.)* The Author not being apprised of this, has by his too great keenness given his supposed opponent an opportunity of having his argument strengthened by this additional evidence.

P. 41. Many exceptions are here made to the Writers applied to in the Treatise, which he opposes. We are sorry to say that we find too much asperity: for he goes so far as to accuse Mr. B. of falsehood and

and absurdity: of which he takes notice in the margin. *Absurdity arising from Mr. Bryant's supposition*: whose insidious art and perversion of the truth are intimated in a note, and his abuse of a passage in Ælian. *The words of Ælian*, says the Author, *concerning Syagrius are, ὅς λεγεται τον Τρωικον πολεμον πρωτος ασαι.* And Mr. B. by writing, *ὅς πρωτος τον Τρωικον ητε πολεμον*, makes Ælian responsible for an assertion, which he only mentions as a prevalent tradition. The Reader will have already found specimens in Mr. B. of this mode of quoting: which I am sorry to observe is extremely unfair. Undoubtedly nothing can be more unfair, and scandalous. But the Reader perhaps will be led to ask, did Mr. B. write any thing to this purpose? Our answer is, not one syllable. Was he guilty of this duplicity? of this wilful and shameful perversion? Not in the least. He applies to Ælian, but does not quote from him. The words, which the Author attributes to Mr. B. as of Ælian perverted, are those of Eustathius, whose name is mentioned, and referred to in the notes. N. 4. And this notice is given, as plainly, as can be desired. It stands obvious to every eye. Notwithstanding which this allegation of falsehood is subjoined: and it is intimated that specimens of this fraud and artifice must have been observed before. We are sorry to say, that these censures have been urged very indiscretely: as have others before, p. 5. where a like accusation of fraud is exhibited; and without the least ground: the whole arising from the misapprehension of the Accuser.

P. 43. Much had been said about the history of Iphigenia, who was supposed to have been sacrificed at Aulis. The Author asks, *who are the Authors, on whose contradictions Mr. B. lays so great a stress? Different anecdotes concerning Achilles and Iphigenia are differently related by Eusebius, (apud Scaligerum) Ptolemy Hepb. apud Photium; Scholia of Apollonius, Philostratus, Tzetzes, Antoninus Liberalis, Hyginus; and the poetical writers, Lucretius, Propertius, Euripides, and Ovid. Obscurity, comparative modernism or poetical license, form the characteristics of the whole list.* To these must be joined Plutarch and Pliny, who speak of the same history: and to them many others might be added, who were of the same antiquity and in the like predicament. The Author sets out, as we see by his Title Page, to vindicate the Poets and Writers of old. But he has certainly mistaken abuse for vindication; and instead of shewing them favour, he has said every thing he could against them. Whoever talks in this way, must be little acquainted with the Writers, of whom he treats. It is to be observed, that he gives the name of anecdotes to articles, of which many have been published above these two thousand years. He also introduces Euripides of the Grecians, and Lucretius of the Romans, without any discrimination, among Writers, whom he styles obscure, or comparatively modern. If so: who were either ancient or excellent of those two nations? How many noble Writers for the same reason must be banished, if these are excluded? As for Euripides being a poet, and using poetical licence: we have said before that Homer was a poet, and used the like liberties: and Euripides of
Hellas

Hellas is as worthy to be regarded concerning events of his Country, as Homer, or any foreigner. They both dealt largely in fable, et bene sunt comparati. The Author himself, who rejects Euripides, applies at times to Tzetzes, who lived above a thousand years later: and even to Freinshemius, p. 117. He should have considered, that among the Writers, whom he styles comparatively modern, are to be found of the same age persons, to whom we are beholden for large and curious portions of ancient events: which but for them would have been lost. Even Photius who came later, and whom he affects to despise, has laid us on this account under great obligations. What numbers of antecedent historians are quoted in the Parallela of Plutarch? And as he has, like many other Writers, transmitted intelligence to a great amount from the most early Writers, he together with them may be esteemed virtually as of the highest antiquity. The same may be said of Athenæus, Stobæus, Strabo, Pliny, A. Gellius, and many of the learned Fathers; who have afforded much ancient intelligence, and to whom we are greatly indebted.

P. 54, 55. It had been mentioned, in order to shew, that the Heroes in Homer never existed, that their names were often borrowed from circumstances after their death; also, because many of them, are represented as having no real father; but were supposed to be the offspring of lakes, rivers, and nymphs; and those of a higher class were the sons of Jupiter, Mars and Venus; or of some other Deity. To obviate this the Author tells us—*Mr. B. had told us however in the*

page before that *Homer was engaged in a period of obscurity.*-----Yet he blames him for not possessing the genealogies of his Heroes more than one or two generations. Nobody deals more than the Author in false attacks, and evasions. We cannot see any appearance of that blame cast on the Poet by Mr. B. which is here unduly intimated. And if there had, it would not have been, because Homer could not carry up his genealogies above one or two generations: but because he could not often carry them up at all; not even one generation. He made many of his Chieftans the immediate sons of Mars, Jupiter, Venus, Thetis, Mercury, and other imaginary Parents. As the names and genealogies of Princes are to be found in the early annals of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria, and in other regions; we might expect to find them here. The Heroes of Homer have therefore been set aside by Mr. B. on account of this deficiency. In opposition to this, the Author gives for an instance to the contrary, the divine birth of Alexander, p. 55. But this is by no means competent. He was never seriously looked upon as the son of Jupiter: nor had he any divine name, or patronymic to that purpose. He is mentioned as the son of Philip by Plutarch, Arrian, and every other writer; and uniformly called Alexander. The Author tries to shew the truth and propriety of these names in Homer, by an instance, which never took place. We can never from the idle notion about Alexander, prove that Sarpedon was the son of Jupiter, or Achilles of Thetis: nor that any person passed for the son of a Deity, that had a true father of his own. One absurdity can never give sanction to another.

P. 59. It had been observed, that among the national Deities from whom Homer borrowed the names of his Heroes, one was Agamemnon, a title of Jupiter. And it was shewn from Staphylus Naucraticus, Lycophron, and others, that under this denomination he was worshipped in Sparta, Attica, and at Troy. Lycophron says of Priam before the æra of the Grecians coming there, (for it is said prophetically)—*that the old king should die at the altar of Jupiter Agamemnon.* v. 335. The Author however insists, that this title of Agamemnon related to a man: and he argues in this manner in defence of his notion. *Supposing Agamemnon, however, to have been one of the various names or epithets under which Jupiter was honoured, is it not just as probable, that it should be given to men by the custom of the times, as that Homer in violation of every custom, should adopt a name which could only be given to men.* The sentences are so long, and so confused, that we really do not see precisely the Author's scope: but this may be owing to our want of discernment. As to its being probable that the name might be given to men, it is idle to have recourse to probability; for the thing is certain, and was never disputed. The great Commander of the Grecian army is continually so called by Homer. The Author tries with great labour to prove what was always granted. The great question is, whether it was not previously given to a Deity. Let us adhere to this, and not wander from the question. This is in the notes denied; and he says that the two verses from Lycophron, *which Mr. B. quotes very rightly.*----are prophetic

phetic of the future dignity of the Hero, they cannot be construed into a proof, that Agamemnon had been previously a title of Jupiter. Of all assertions this seems to be the most rash and blind, that was ever made. The hero, of whom he speaks is neither mentioned, nor alluded to in those two verses; the person spoken of is Priam of Troy, whose hoary hairs were to be basely violated.---'Ο δ' ἀμφι τυμβῶ τε γαμεμνονος δαμεις, κρηπίδα πηγῶ νερθε καλλυνει πλοκῶ. He was to be slain at the altar of Agamemnon Jupiter. This however is said to relate to quite a different history. *They are*, says the Author, *prophetic of the future dignity of the Hero: they cannot be construed into a proof, that Agamemnon had been previously a title of Jupiter.* Notes to p. 59. Who would think, that there could possibly be such misapprehension? He supposes the death of old king Priam to be prophetic of the future dignity of another king: so that death and dignity are synonymous. And as he insists that this controverted title did not belong to the Deity, he says that the Commentators upon Lycophron, such as Canterus, Meursius, and Potter are of his opinion: that is, it was not a title of Jupiter, notes p. 59. First then let us see, what Canterus maintains upon this head. His words are—Agamemnonis nomen Jovi tribuitur—colebatur autem hoc numen Spartæ. p. 12. Let us next observe the opinion of Meursius. p. 62. Reprehendit Lycophronem Lamb. Hortensius; quod Cassandram inducat vaticinantem, moriturum Priamum ad Jovis Agamemnonis aram p. 62. How justly Lycophron is blamed, we shall not here debate. It is certain that the verses
according.

according to Meursius relate to Jupiter Agamemnon at Troy quite contrary to the Author's assertion. The last application must be to the learned Potter, who referring to the altar of Agamemnon says---*id est Jovis.* p. 140. The Author has appealed to these three judicious Commentators upon Lycophron for a sanction to his notion, who are all decidedly against him. To these may be added Eustathius, as quoted by Potter: *δοκει ευλογως παρα Λακωσι Ζευς Αγαμεμνων επιθετικως ειναι.* We find that among the Spartans Agamemnon was an epithet of Jupiter. And it has been shewn, that in Attica and at Troy it was used in the same manner.

We have the like evidence from Athenagoras, who informs us, that Helena also had the same worship among the Ilienses. But the Author denies the veracity of this early Father upon the authority of Tzetzes. Now as he has shewn such aversion to modern evidence, how came he above to set aside the testimony not only of this Father, but of Euripides, and Lycophron; and now embrace the opinion of a Person, who was far above a thousand years later than either? After mentioning Tzetzes, p. 59, he says, *The passage from Athenagoras has the same tendency, however perverted by Mr Bryant. He (Athenagoras) is actually summing up the names of the Heroes, and Heroines, who were afterwards worshipped.* Let us observe the passage, to which he refers. *Ὁ μὲν Ἰλιεύς Θεὸν Ἑκτορὰ λέγει, καὶ τὴν Ἑλένην Ἀδράστειαν ἐπισταμενὸς προσκυνεῖ. Ὁ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιος Ἀγαμεμνονα Δία.* p. 277. Now, says the Author, notes p. 59. *if Agamemnon was a name of Jupiter, and distinct from the Hero,*

the introduction of him here is totally foreign to the purpose: And the Author (Athenagoras) sufficiently explains his own meaning by the context. He certainly does: but we are sorry to say, that this meaning the Author of the Vindication never arrived at. The intention of this learned Father was to address the two Cæsars of his time in favour of the religion, which he professed. And this he performed in a glorious appeal, in which he laid before them, as matter of just complaint, that every Religion, however base, and every Deity, however strange, were tolerated in the Roman Empire, excepting Christ, and Christianity. Among other uncommon Deities was Helena Adrastea, the same as Nemesis, worshipped by the Ilienses: also Jupiter Agamemnon, revered both in Ilium and at Sparta; and Hector both at Ilium and Thebes in Bœotia; to which place according to Pausanias his worship was brought from Phrygia. These three were very obscure Divinities, and the rest will be found to be as little known, though of great antiquity. Hence we may perceive, that these, and many others, were ancient and uncommon names of Deities, which Homer borrowed, and gave to his Heroes, and other personages.

The Author mentions (p. 59. notes) that Athenagoras in this passage *is summing up the names of the Heroes and the Hercines that were afterwards* (that is after the ruin of Troy) *worshipped.* But they were antecedent to Troy: and there was no occasion for any deep calculation, or summing up; for including the three preceding, the number amounts to but eight. Among these is Tenes, the founder of Tenedos,
and

and Phylonoë, little known: also Agraulos, Pandrosus, and Erechtheus: none of which had the least concern with the war of Troy, nor are they to be judged by that æra. They seem to have been obscure local Deities; and, according to their history, far antecedent to that war. Erechtheus is said to have been the same as Neptune; and who Tenes was; we learn from Cicero. *Tenem apud Tenedios putant esse sanctissimum Deum, ac eorum urbem condidisse.* He was antecedent to the City Tenedos; see Cicero *Orat. in Verrem prima. C. 19. p. 275, Gronov.* Phylonoë was by some supposed to be Proserpine: Aglaurus and Pandrosus, with their sister Herse not here mentioned, were the daughters of Cecrops; who was supposed to have reigned between three and four hundred years before the siege of Troy, and many years even before the foundation of the City. We may therefore be assured, that these persons mentioned by Athenagoras were not the Heroes and Heroines, who were afterwards worshipped. They were according to their history far more early, and had no relation to Troy.

P. 66. The Author tries continually to evade the force of the arguments, which he cannot answer: and often founds his objections upon articles, which were never denied. Metrodorus Lampsacenus was mentioned as a person, who lived very near Troas; and must have been well acquainted with that region. The same was said of Anaxagoras, who resided in the same place; and was a philosopher of great eminence, and had Pericles, Euripides, and Socrates for his disciples. They did not allow, that there was any Grecian invasion, nor any war

of Troy. To this the Author answers with a question: *Were they the most ancient, and does Mr. B's chronology inform him of no writers whose births were prior to the 17th. Olympiad?* We are not here concerned about antiquity: though these persons were sufficiently ancient: but about the opportunities of knowing, which these Writers had from their situation. The Author proceeds---*If Mr. B. will consult his Æschylus, whose antiquity is at least some few years higher; that Author will show him, how common the different traditions were in his time.* (p. 66.) Nobody denies it. The Grecians had universally traditions without number, and they had early Writers: but what is all this to the purpose? Here were two Persons, of high repute in their time, who had the best opportunities of knowledge: and the result was, that they believed the two poems of Homer to have been allegories. This is the point, on which we are to dwell, and not suffer our attention to be taken off by details about antiquity; or by any thing foreign to the subject.

The Author certainly indulges too much in resentment, and obloquy; which he expresses very severely to persons long since departed. *Homer's story, he says, has survived---whilst Metrodorus, and Anaxagoras have been consigned to that oblivion from which Mr. B. has raked their memories.* p. 66. This is unnecessarily contemptuous: and very unbecoming. How little must the Author be acquainted with Plato, Cicero, and Laertius, who bear such honourable testimony of these persons? He has taken up two pages in the abuse of Anaxagoras, mentioning some
idle

idle and doubtful traditions concerning him : not at all considering his profound philosophy, and celebrated character, which was never *consigned to oblivion*. We have seen above how he has treated the memory of Euripides, Lycophron, Ptolemy Hephæstion, Eusebius, and others; and from several passages to which he applies, he shews, that he did not truly understand them, nor could he be conversant with them. We generally say, that *familiarity breeds contempt*; but we here see the most sovereign contempt with very little acquaintance. This very Author, who sets aside Writers of such excellence, introduces Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis as genuine Greek Writers, and applies for their sanction. p. 77.

P. 67, 68. The Author here speaks of Mr. B. *bringing evidence against him*. But how could he bring evidence against a treatise, which he never saw: or oppose a person, who wrote two years after him? The passage alluded to is, where Herodotus says, that Helen never was at Troy. And if she were not at Troy, the inference drawn from it is, that there could be no expedition upon her account. This is the article to be obviated. But our attention is taken off from the consideration of this argument, to quite a different object. There were some Cyprian verses mentioned by this Historian, in which, as well as in Homer, the flight of Helen with Paris was asserted. Herodotus treats of these for a while, and at last gives them up with some disgust. Upon this, the Author of the Vindication makes the following remarks, p. 67. *Herodotus having long argued against this fact (the flight*

flight of Helen) and against the authenticity of some Cyprian verses which mention it; having endeavoured as much as he could to illustrate Homer, reverting to his history, he says, adieu now to Homer and the Cyprian verses. These words I will just observe are translated by Mr. B.---*Away with them together, a long farewell to each, both to Homer and the Cyprian verses. This specimen will put the reader on his guard against Mr. B's translations.* The Author does not comprehend the meaning of the Historian, and passes over too hastily the article to be decided, that *Helen never was at Troy*. Instead of this, he enters into a cavil about words; in which he is totally mistaken. He admonishes the reader here, as in other places, to be upon his guard against Mr. B. and places him in such a light, that a stranger must suppose him to be a person of the greatest falsehood. And all this resentment is shewn, because Mr. B. has given a paraphrastical interpretation, instead of a literal version: as such a version would not express the meaning and disposition of the Historian.-----Ὅμηρος μὲν νῦν καὶ τὰ Κυπρίων ἐπεὰ χαιρετῶ. *Away with them: I will have nothing more to do with them.* The same manner of expression is in many instances to be observed; though it has been said by others, as well as the Author, that it is never to be found. Take the following example.

Ελπίς, καὶ σὺ τύχη, μέγα χαιρετε, τὸν λιμὲν ἔυρον·

Οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ χ' ὑμῖν, παίζετε τῆς μετ' ἐμεῖ·

Away with ye, fond Hope, and Fortune: I have gained a safe harbour: I have nothing more to do with ye. Sport with others for the future, who
may

may come after me. This is the true purport which a literal translation cannot express. *Χαίρε* and *χαίρετω*, are not always used, as a compliment, and a benediction, as some have insisted, but quite the reverse. What says the learned Stephanus? Porro et iis *χαίρειν* dicimus, quos in malam rem abire jubemus: quos in malam crucem relegamus; seu quos cum contemptu relinquimus. This objection therefore originated from a mistake. In the mean time our attention has been drawn off from the true object, viz. Helen being carried to Troy, which Herodotus denied: and all the evidence, which had been afforded the Author to that purpose, is unduly omitted.

P. 69. In this place, and many others, the Author would maintain the certainty of the war from its being universally credited, and credited by persons of the greatest learning and knowledge. He mentions (p. 122.) Hesiod, Herodotus, Thucydides and Diodorus. To these he might have added, Solon, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Plato, Socrates, Xenophon, Aristotle, and others without number, who were the most brilliant luminaries of Greece. We may therefore allow this belief in the most enlightened part of the world. But at the same time we must consider, that the wisest men have often the greatest weaknesses. These very persons believed in Satyrs, Nymphs, and Centaurs; also in Gods of the woods and rivers: and in monstrous Deities of the Deep. They were slaves to the basest rites; and maintained the vilest Theology that ever was adopted. They were devoted to Augury and Aruspicy; and dreaded phantoms and furies.

Even

Even Homer, that *accurate describer of manners*, who, it is said, *could not be guilty of any violation of truth*, maintained that the horses of Achilles could speak; that Diana was boxed and beaten by Juno; that Jupiter was deceived by an owl, and dozed upon Mount Ida; lastly, that Mars and Venus were caught in bed together by Vulcan, and ensnared in a net: *cum multis aliis*.

The Athenians and their neighbours looked up to Homer, and his writings, as numberless nations do to Mahomet and his Koran. If extent of faith, and universality among any people can determine the truth, it must be allowed to the Mahommedans, above all others. Their religion is established in a large portion of Europe; and through the whole of Asia Minor: and it occupies all Arabia, and Persia, and is extended to some of the farthest islands in the east. To these must be added a large share of Africa: to all which Hellas of old if compared, would not amount to the fiftieth part. Their faith is extensive and absolute, yet founded in error. But it may be urged, that these nations are base and illiterate, and no just comparison can be formed. Let us then consider Europe, the most enlightened part of the world. We shall here find articles maintained universally in some nations, which are by many thought to be repugnant both to reason and truth. Among those, who have held these tenets, have been some of the most learned persons, that ever graced the world. Thucydides therefore, and the Sages of Greece, however knowing and excellent, were still liable to err, and to believe a fable.

P. 75. The Author takes notice that Mr. B. *for several pages contends strongly, that Homer was not an Asiatic, but a native of Greece, probably of Ithaca.* The argument was certainly extended through many pages, but it seems wrong to say, that he contends strongly; for he only lays his evidence before the Reader, and leaves to him to conclude: for he does not presume to be certain. This evidence was very curious, and collected with much labour from a variety of ancient Writers. But the whole goes for nothing with the Author, he never concerns himself about the authorities produced; but has omitted them all, and then too superciliously tells us---*mere conjecture requires no answer. I have waved the contest.* p. 76. The strongest proofs are to him mere fancy, and demonstration itself a delirium, or dream. What is extraordinary, he immediately after this pays Mr. B. a compliment and says, p. 76. *that he has the pleasure of agreeing with him in some points, and not knowing any real authority, that either contradicts, or confirms one tittle of his assertions.* This is doing Mr. B. great honour: yet upon consideration it appears to be a blind concession. For why does he so continually dissent from Mr. B. where there is accumulated proof; and now agree with him, when he confesses, *that he does not know any real authority to confirm one tittle of what he asserts?*

P. 12. He observes, that Mr. B. has made a wrong calculation of the Grecian forces at the battle of Plataea: and that they did not consist, as he has stated them, of 72500 men; but of 73200. Mr. B.

is obliged to him for this intimation : and if any opportunity should be afforded, he will avail himself of this intelligence. But if we allow the Grecians both with light armed, and unarmed troops, to have amounted in the whole to 110,000, as they are stated by Herodotus, yet these will never countenance an hundred thousand, some centuries before at the supposed æra of Troy. It is difficult to assent to many articles, which the Author upon this occasion lays down as certain. As I have before said, I cannot believe, that grand alliances were formed, where there *was little or no connexion* : that freedom subsisted, where there was no police, nor security : that a distant correspondence was maintained, when there *was no commerce* : and that honour prevailed, where *every petty chief was a thief and marauder*. Plutarch tells us, that when Theseus arrived at a state of manhood, which was about the time of Helen's birth, Greece swarmed with banditti. Οὐδεν μέρους καθαρὸν καὶ ἀκινδύνον ὑπὸ ληπτῶν, καὶ κακούργων. Theseus, p. 3. *No part of it was exempt, and safe, from thieves and villains* : of whom he gives a fearful account. p. 3. The like is to be found in Thucydides. L. 1. C. 2. p. 2. who says, there was no commerce, nor correspondence carried on either by sea or land, without dread and danger. Yet the Author supposes, that this was an æra of general liberty. As to the *Godlike Chiefs, the Men of Justice*, of whom he has before treated, we may suppose Hercules, Pirithous, and Theseus, to have been of that order. Yet notwithstanding their specious character on one hand, they are on the other represented as men of violence, and guilty of rapes

rapes and rapine. Theseus and his comrade are supposed to have been condemned to prison, and to everlasting durance after repeated outrages of this sort. Their first intercourse happened on account of a depredation; when a herd of Cattle was stolen, which one had purloined from the other. Plutarch. p. 14. The characters of these pretended Heroes, these *Men of Justice*, are always upon the extreme. They are one minute represented as Demi-gods, and the next as noxious Demons: and the latter character seems to prevail, like the Oak in the Poet---

Quantum vertice ad auras

Æthereas, tantum radice ad Tartara, tendunt.

Thucydides takes notice, that robbery and plunder were common, and not discouraged. L. 1. C. 5. p. 5. Neleus, the father of Nestor, made the price of his daughter's nuptials the flocks and herds of his next neighbour; which he, who would win her, was to steal. Odyss. A. v. 288. Pausanias. L. 4. p. 374. He was in his turn robbed; and his son Nestor made ample reprisals, of which he gives an account. Il. A. v. 676. These deeds of misrule and injustice were so common, that Ulysses is made to ask the *Godlike* Agamemnon in the shades below, whether he did not loose his life in acts of piracy and sheep-stealing? Odyss. A. v. 401. Agamemnon puts the same question to Amphimedon. How came you, and your companions to loose your lives? Were ye overwhelmed in a tempest: or were ye slain in an attempt to plunder other people's sheep and cattle? Odyss. Ω. v. 112. Their God Mercury served for an example: who was said to have been born in the morning; to have played a tune upon the harp at

noon, and to have stolen a herd of oxen in the evening. Ἐσπεριος βας κλειψεν. Hymn. to Merc. v. 17. Such were the customs, and such the principles, of these times. For if the Deity was a rogue, what must have been his votaries? The Author has mistaken Homer, and thought, that the pictures drawn by him were copies of those times. But the characters afforded by the Poet were formed by his own exalted genius, which is said to have raised men to Gods. He exceeded Nature, and we may use the words of Thucydides upon another occasion---*ηνεικος επι το μειζον μεν ποιητην οντα κοσμησαι*. L. 1. C. 10. p. 10. But though he dresses up his chief Heroes in a complete and shining panoply; yet we may sometimes descry strong marks of primitive ferity and rudeness.

The Author, to shew how easily such a great armament might be formed, tells us, p. 6. that *Greece at this time swarmed with warlike adventurers, and whilst Agriculture was neglected, and Commerce unknown, her bands of warriors, led by enterprising chieftains, were ever ready to assemble, when the standard of war was erected*. This is a specious picture, but whence was it copied? Nobody knows. Yet he assures us, that the same spirit exists in modern Greece, as prevailed in the ancient. *Greece, at this moment, swarms with adventurous hordes who are ever ready to join in the wars of the Turkish Governors, and are frequently employed in the heart of Asia, on whatever side the greatest pay is to be acquired, or the greatest plunder is to be expected*. He adds some other circumstances, which he thinks similar, and says, (p. 8.)

this

this analogy is unanswerable. I fear it will be found upon inquiry, that no analogy subsists between them; and that he is mistaken in his notions of both. I never heard of any *hordes of Grecians*, nor can I believe, that they are so eager to join in *Turkish wars*. It is not credible, that Christians should so readily list under the banner of Mahomet. I must have some good authority, before I credit the assertion: but I have never met with any; and the Author affords none. He seems to be equally mistaken in his account of ancient Greece; which he embellishes greatly. We have seen that he speaks of bands of warriors, and enterprising Chieftans, who were ready to unite at the display of a standard. But how does he know this, when there is not the least intimation given? On the contrary, the country is represented as divided into small districts, and abounding with banditti, who were always in a state of hostility, and making depredations upon one another. Thucyd. L. 1. C. 5. p. 5. There was no union in those times; no common cause. *Προ των Τρωικων εδεν φαινεται προτερον κοινη εργασασμενη η Ελλας.* *The Grecians never engaged in any common cause before the war of Troy.* *ibid.* p. 5. Nor even then; for the reasons mentioned by Plutarch, and this very Historian; however they may credit the war. The Author of the Vindication sets off these times of misrule to the best advantage; and makes use of this luxuriant colouring too often in the course of his work. He tries also to ascertain the Poet's veracity by the Poet's own evidence. It was thought not credible, that so many persons should
engage

engage in a confederacy and war, who had no connection, and had received no injury. To this the Author replies, by saying : *to this confederacy -----a number of warriors acceded, who were by no means personally injured; and who had little or no connexion with Menelaus, p. 7.* Achilles is particularly mentioned. He here makes use of the very thing controverted, for a decisive proof in its favour; and begs the question. But this is not sufficiently logical, as I believe most will agree.

I had omitted an article of reprehension which the Author here brings, in consequence of an argument, which I had advanced. *It was a long time, he (Mr. B.) says, before the Greeks ventured to traverse the Ægean, and quotes Libanius to prove, that they never ventured farther than Delos.* And in the Notes he adds : *Libanius was tutor to Julian; and his authority therefore respecting the state of early Greece, is entitled to very little attention, (if any) when controverted by the ancient historians.* p. 16. The Author, as I have said before, never considers, that Writers like Libanius, had access to many ancient histories, which are now lost: and they deserve far more regard, than he is willing to allow. The Persons, who, as he intimates, controvert the words of Libanius, I know not: nor does the Author produce a single instance, ancient or modern. Let us then see, by whom Libanius is supported. It is by the evidence of Herodotus, upon which the argument of Mr B was chiefly founded. The words of this Historian were introduced by Mr. B. immediately subsequent to the former, and ought to have been taken notice of at the same time. But they are very improperly omitted;

ted; and the truth is for a while suspended, that the reader may be left to believe, that Libanius was the only Writer, to whom Mr. B. appealed. After a delay of two pages, the Author mentions the passage in Herodotus, which he introduces in the following manner, p. 18. *But he (Mr. B.) strengthens his argument still farther by a quotation from Herodotus, who says, that a fleet from Argolis and Sparta, refused in the Persian war to sail beyond Delos. Mr. B. it will be observed in this passage, puts a little dash where a part of the sentence is omitted.* The intention of Mr. B. has been above mentioned. This was to shew, that the Grecians, and particularly the Lacedæmonians, were in these times very little skilled in the art of navigation. He therefore very innocently omitted, what he thought not at all either to his purpose, or against it. And of this omission he gave fair notice: not thinking that any exception could by any reasonable person be made. The Author proceeds-----*But the Reader should be informed, that the rest of it runs thus. All beyond seemed full of danger; as they had little knowledge of those parts, which appeared to them to be full of enemies. Their fears then proceeded from the dread of falling in with a superior fleet.* How can the Author, when he imputes to Mr. B. a deficiency, be himself so defective, and untrue in his representation? I have said, that the circumstance to be proved was the insufficiency of the Grecians in navigation. And to evade this, the Author first cavils about a dash: and then tries to extenuate and pervert the true meaning of the Historian. The passage, which the Author says, *runs thus*, is attended with

some material difference, and will be found to be as follows. *When the Ionians solicited the Helladians to pass over to their coast, the utmost, that they could obtain, was to get them as far as Delos. All beyond seemed full of danger, as they had little knowledge of those parts, and the whole seemed to be filled with the enemies forces. An expedition as far as Samos appeared to them a voyage to the Pillars of Hercules.* Herod. L. 8. C. 132. p. 682. Here it is to be observed, that when the Author says in his version, that *the Grecians refused to sail beyond Delos*, the Historian tells us, 'Οι Ιωνες προηγαγον αυτες μογεις μεχρι Δηλος. They had much ado to get them so far. Some other articles he has either extenuated or omitted, in order to evade their force. He sets aside the chief reason, mentioned by Herodotus, for the backwardness of the Grecians, and would persuade us, that it was owing intirely to another cause. *Their fears then, he says, proceeded from the dread of falling in with a superior fleet.* Not a word of any fleet is mentioned by the Historian, nor does the word στρατια necessarily signify a fleet. Whatever additional fears they may have had upon the occasion, I shall not dispute. It is intimated, that they were rather imaginary, by the word εδοκε. The first and true cause of their not venturing farther than Delos, is said expressly to have arisen from their not being acquainted with those parts---ε των χωρων εστι εμπειροισι. Then come the words---στρατιης τε παντα ωλεα εδοκε ειναι, and *all places seemed to be filled with the enemies forces.* These subsequent fears could not cancel their antecedent ignorance. We have seen, that it was farther said, that

they

they looked upon an expedition to the island Samos as a voyage to the Atlantic: which the Author unduly omits. These articles he had before his eyes; and accuses Mr. B. of omitting, what did not seem at all necessary to be mentioned: at the same time he is himself guilty of omissions of consequence; and of perverting the Historian's meaning.

After all, if the Author's objection was better founded, it would be of little consequence, excepting only, that it draws off the attention of the Reader from the main object to be considered. For let the cause be what it may, either the ignorance, or the fears, of the Grecians, still we are told, that they ventured not beyond Delos; that they were unacquainted with the opposite coast; and not experienced in the art of navigation. If then they knew so little in the time of the Persian war, there is no reason to think, that they were more knowing in times of far higher antiquity.

PART THE SECOND.

P. 78. The Author of the Vindication has shewn uncommon asperity against the person, whom he opposes, and speaks repeatedly of his futility and absurdity; and this contemptuous behaviour pervades his whole Treatise. He therefore cannot be offended, if on the other hand some mention should be made of his prudence. His purpose in this Second Part of his work, is to shew the situation of Troy; and this, if it can be ascertained, must be best effected by the places in its vicinity, which had a connexion with it. They must certainly afford to one another reciprocal light. They are mentioned by Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy, Antoninus, and occasionally by others: and when compared, may afford the light mentioned. We should therefore expect, that the Author, and his Friend, in their Maps, would avail themselves of these advantages. Without these helps we may form numberless imaginary positions: and if such evidence be neglected, there will be nothing to confute them. I say then, that we should expect, that these Gentlemen would introduce the chief Cities and Towns, mentioned by Homer, in this part of the world. But this is not done. For they have prudently omitted most of the ancient places in the region of Troas, as they could not be made to correspond

pond with the situation, which they have given to the City. Abydas to the north, and Lectum to the south, are not to be found in their maps, though they were the boundaries of the Region, with which the Poet was principally concerned. From the distance of these two places proper measurement might be made of the situation of others. On this account they are prudently left out. The Author has not mentioned, in his map, Dardanum, or Dardania: nor Ilium, Pagus Iliensium, Chryse, Achæum, Portus Archivorum, Colone, Cebrene, Scepsis, or Hamaxitus. Even Ida is omitted, though so necessary to be known. However widely it may have been extended, the name of it never occurs. Cotylus and Gargarus are in like manner excluded. It is said by Virgil,-----Est in conspectu Tenedos; which notice is quite contrary to the Author's opinion: and the Island in consequence of it is not suffered to appear. He saw, that it was situated low towards the south, and nearly opposite to the City Troas; and far removed from Bounarbachî, and consequently would ruin his plan, if admitted. In the room of all these ancient places, he has brought others of modern date, which draw off the attention of the unwary Reader. We are accordingly treated with Tchiblack, Jeni Cheyr, Erkissiqui, Jeni Keu, Dahri, Feranli, and Bos, with which we are not at all concerned in the inquiry. He might as well have inserted Demarary, Issiquibo, and Nantucket; they would have afforded just as much emolument to the Reader. In the execution of this work, he follows Mr. Chevalier, *whose map, he says, he found as accurate, as*

that of Mr. B. was erroneous. But of these supposed mistakes not one single instance is produced. He however acknowledges, that *in some trifles he differs even* from his Friend. This difference in respect to one article, is by no means *trifling*; but of great consequence. It relates to the island Tenedos above mentioned; which by most writers was supposed to have been within view of Troy, and lay opposite to the coast of Troas. This Mr. Chevalier had introduced: but I have shewn that the Author, for particular reasons, omits it.

The Author having with much art and industry got rid of this obstacle, now ventures to prosecute his scheme; and places the City Troy some miles inland, upon the hill Bounarbachi, one of the eminences of ancient Ida; and so acknowledged by Mr. Chevalier. But here an unexpected difficulty arose: for looking more accurately into the Treatise, which he opposed, he found that Troy was situated in a plain, *εν πεδιῳ*: whereas he owns, that the village of Bouñarbachi stands above the plain, p. 96. It is *a place*, says Chevalier (p. 30.) *on every side encompassed with precipices*. About a mile beyond the village this Traveller places in his Map, *Troja Vetus*: and it is repeated in another Map (p. 115.) where he places Troja at large. The Author of the Vindication says himself—*We ascended the opposite hill to Bounarbachi* (p. 91.) How could he possibly suppose a City, situated on these heights, to be in a plain? He has hampered himself past remedy: and we may say—

Verte omnes tete in facies, et contrahe quicquid

Sive animis, sive arte vales.

What expedient can be found? The Author thinks that he has discovered one. He accordingly says, that the City indeed was in the plain: but the Citadel stood on the top of the hill. (p. 93.) But his evasion will not serve. He himself has placed the City high up beyond the Village: and the Scæan Gate (how justly I will not say) is placed upon the hill. Here is *Trojæ Situs*, as determined under his own hand in his Map, and in his Plate, p. 92. and he represents himself as an eye witness. As he is so very severe, he should have been more cautious: for this contrariety must be deemed very reprehensible. Had the person, whom he attacks, been guilty of such an instance of inconsistency, he would have pronounced---Ψευδῆσθαι ὁδοιπορον ἀνδρα, and have given him no quarter.

He however tries to strengthen his argument (p. 94.) by a line in Homer.

-----ἐνθα μαλίστα

Ἀμβρατος ἐστὶ πόλις, καὶ ἐπιδρομον ἐπλετο τεῖχος.

The words---ἐπιδρομον τεῖχος he renders---*The wall was on a level plain:* and immediately in the very next line tells us, that *the wall stood upon uneven and sloping ground.* p. 94.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

After all, what can be more strange, than to suppose, that the words τεῖχος ἐπιδρομον, by which is meant any thing *pervious*, and easily

overrun,

overrun, and in this place easily ascended, signified a flat? He himself, suspecting his mistake, renders the words *τειχος επιδρομον* afterwards---where the foot of the wall was easily accessible. p. 94. But how can the same words signify at one time a wall in a level plain: and at another, the foot of a wall easily accessible? Though he has tried with much art and industry, to rid himself of the difficulties, into which his own evidence has brought him, yet hæret lateri lethalis arundo. He cannot free himself from it. Though he has at last brought Troy down to the plain, and leaves only the Citadel on the mountain: yet he confutes himself in an instant; and in his plate of the City, p. 92, he reinstates it, and places it, as appears on a very high eminence; which he acknowledges to be Bounarbachi. There was another article, which he did not consider, when he placed Troy at, or towards, the foot of the hill. Homer does not say only, that it was in the plain of Ida, but it was *τηλοθι*, a great way from Mount Ida: (Ω. 662.) with which, after all his trouble, his position does not agree.

He assures us that the situation, which he has given to Troy, accords in every article, and amounts to a demonstration. Yet it does not coincide in any one instance. The distance from the camp is far too great, which has been noticed: but that notice is past over without any just reply. He says, p. 109. that *the distance from the sources of the Scamander*, (so he calls some little fountains below Bounarbachi) *to the Sigæan is there laid down* (by Mr. Chevalier) *at about*

nine

nine miles and a half: and indeed this is nearly consonant to the truth. Now in his own map these fountains are a long mile from Bounar-bachi, and Troy is still higher. Let us therefore take the most moderate computation, and suppose the camp to have been ten miles only from his Trojæ Situs; yet how could those marches and retreats have happened in so small a space, as they are described by the Poet? In that day, wherein Patroclus appears, the Grecian Army is supposed to have fought their way in a stubborn dispute, to the walls of Troy, and back again to the ships; then to have advanced a second time, and to be driven back: the whole of which amounts to forty miles. How could a hundred thousand men, or one hundred men, with such obstacles, go over the space mentioned, in the time given? It is impossible. This also has been urged by Mr. B. but not duly regarded. To remedy the difficulties which arise from this distance, the Author places the Grecian Camp three miles inland, and nearer; and supposes the land below, to have been an increment from the sea; for which he has not in this place the least evidence. Yet he assures us, that *Mr. Chevalier takes notice of—a considerable accretion of land at the mouth of the Simois* (p. 109.) Not one word to this purpose is to be found in the Author appealed to. On the contrary, Mr. Chevalier accuses Mr. Wood for having entertained so wild a notion. He asks him, (p. 77.) *what proof he had—and in what particular part this accretion has happened?* He adds: *It is even easy to prove, that no considerable increase can exist there, because the impetuous currents of the Hellespont constantly prevent*

prevent this, by sweeping the sands away, as fast as they accumulate at the mouth. He says, Mr. Wood's own account compleatly refutes his hypothesis of an accretion. Note to p. 77. The Author however persists, and begs the Reader only to look at the drawing in the Map of Mr. Chevalier---*The long low points of flat marshy land running forward into the sea evince their origin.* But what are *long low points* against plain and intelligible writing, by which the truth is signified? What are these uncertain dots to the decisive, and positive declaration of the Writer; who denies what is blindly affirmed of him, and gives a direct contradiction to the whole?

The Author of the Vindication speaks of this part of the region somewhat artfully, and describes it, as *flat marshy land, running forward into the sea.* The converse may equally be maintained, and it may just as reasonably be described, as *a flat marshy land, running backward into the Country*: so that this artifice will not avail. In short this marsh has arisen from an ancient lake; which is taken notice of by more authors than one. Strabo gives a very clear, and accurate account of the coast, from Abydus downward, and says, that the next City below was Dardanus: between which and Abydus ran the river Rhodius, opposite to Cunosema, upon the Thracian Chersonesa. Near to these was the promontory Ophrynum, and the lake Pteleos. Strabo. L. 13. p. 889. This river Rhodius, just above Ophrynum, is what the Author of the Vindication, and other Moderns seem to have taken either for the Simois, or Scamander: though neither of these rivers are to be
looked

looked for in these parts. The lake Pteleos is by Strabo placed just where the marsh land appears now, near Ophrynium, which seems to be the cape Janisary of the Moderns. The Map of Mr. Wood gives the best view of this fenny ground, and of a lake, which still subsists with a small river, which runs into it. p. 306. The water was also observed by Dr. Pocock. vol. 2. p. 104. This was undoubtedly the Pteleos of Strabo: for it lies below Abydus, towards the mouth of the Propontis, or Hellespont, precisely as it is described by that Writer. L. 13. p. 883. It lies inland, and is secluded from the sea. Hence it appears to have been never drained. And in this marshy situation the Author places the camp of the Grecians. These marshes remain now; and were to be seen in the time of Strabo, seventeen hundred years ago. There is reason to think, that they were always the same, as they are fed by a spring and rivulet; and therefore they could not be produced by any accumulation of swampy soil from the sea, for they are inland, and secluded from the coast. This may be in some degree traced in the Map of Mr. Chevalier: but it is far more accurately described in that of Mr. Wood. The Author, of the Vindication was not apprised of this, when he gave a delineation of the coast: but he afterwards observed some faint traces of it, in the exhibition of Mr. Chevalier, and adopted it in his text, when he thought it countenanced his opinion. But in his own map it is not to be seen. He therefore applies to his friend for intelligence: and refers the Reader to his low faint dots, in order to shew

the existence of this fenny ground. Here we cannot help asking an untoward question. As the Grecian Camp is by him here fixed; and as it is a part of the region of particular consequence, towards the determination of the City above, as described by him: how came he to apply to Mr. Chevalier for intelligence, and not to have been himself sufficiently informed? From the account, which he gives, one would imagine, that he had personally and accurately observed every thing material in this particular part, as it more especially demanded his attention. But he intimates, that he knew nothing himself: and refers us to *some long low*, and almost imperceptable, *points* in the Map of his friend, from whom he borrows this intelligence; and mistakes it. For he quotes this evidence to shew, that there had been an accumulation of land from the sea, and that this meer was owing to it. But Mr. Chevalier expressly says, and proves, that there has not been any accession of soil upon the coast: nor could there have been on account of the rapidity of the current at the Hellespont, and Dardanel: which rapidity is mentioned by Tournefort and other Writers. Hence, notwithstanding his zeal for his Friend, he has never read his book, or at least imperfectly, and to no good purpose. Strabo indeed takes notice, that the Scamander brought down a great deal of soil from above, and that there was a large protusion of mud at its mouth. But this was not the river, of which, the Author of the Vindication treats, and which is by him and others placed, between Abydus and Dardanus at the mouth of the Propontis. On the contrary,

it was far below, and its situation may be known from the places, which were above it. These were according to the Geographer before mentioned, in order downwards, as follows: Abydus, Rhodius fl. Dardanus, Rhæteum, Sigeum, Achivorum Portus, Achivorum Castra, and Ostia Scamandri. L. 13. p. 889. 90. And he describes Achæum which was just above the Scamander, *ἡδὴ τῆς Τενεδίων περαιᾶς ὑπαρχον*, as at the passage to Tenedos, and below Ilium. Here the Troy of Homer, and the Grecian Camp, is to be looked for, in the vicinity of the island above, and near Troas Alexandria, Gargarus and Lectum. If it ever existed, here only it can be found. The Author of the Vindication, and his Friend, act very politickly in depreciating Strabo, however great his authority: for if he is to be trusted, almost every article, which they have maintained, is wrong.

The Author however, having fixed the Grecian camp in a very different situation, describes it farther, as being bounded to the left and north by the river Simoïs, which is represented by him, in his map, as here entering the sea. And to shew, that it was not *the subordinate and ignoble river described by Mr. B.* he quotes from the seventh Book of Homer the following (version, p. 88.)

The gulphy Simoïs rolling to the main

Helmet and Shields, and godlike Heroes slain.

But in the original there is nothing of the gulphy Simoïs; nor of its rolling helmets to the main; nor of godlike Heroes. The name of

this river does not once occur in the Book mentioned: nor are these circumstances, which are here attributed to the Simoïs, to be found in any book of Homer, where the river is spoken of. The Author has some how been greatly misguided. The river mentioned in the seventh Book is the Scamander, which (strange to tell) he has totally mistaken. The words are-----

Πολλοὶ γὰρ τεθνασι κερηκομῶντες Ἀχαιοί,
 Τῶν νῦν αἶμα κελαινον εὐρῶσιν ἀμφὶ Σκαμανδρῶν
 Εσκέδασ' ὄξυς Ἀρης. L. vii. v. 328, 329.

The Scamander in these lines is by the Author converted into the *gulph* *Simoïs*; and (αἶμα κελαινον) *the black gore*, is turned into *shields* and *helmets*: and what is said of one river, he attributes to another.

When he has thus in his Treatise, and in his Maps, given the name of the Simoïs to the river, which by the Grecian Camp entered the sea; he informs us soon afterwards, (p. 89.) that it was the Xanthus; and quotes the authority of Mr. Chevalier. And seven lines afterwards he informs us, that the river went by neither of these two names, but was called uniformly the Scamander. Speaking of the epithets *δινῆεις*, *μεγας ποταμος*, and *βαθυδινῆεις*, he adds, *In short, if these epithets are found in the Iliad, they are always allusive to the united waters of the two rivers, which as I have already observed, bore the name of Scamander only. In another place* (p. 88.) he says, *It appears also, that below the junction, the waters of both took the name of Scamander: and, he should*
 have

have added,—never of Simoïs. For that river, together with its name, was absorbed in the Scamander; the smaller in the greater; of which there are as many instances, as there are rivers. Who would think it possible, that contrary to his own evidence he should change this very river, the Scamander, into *the gulphy Simoïs*? But even here he is in some degree mistaken: for the Scamander (supposing this to be the true river) did not first receive its name after the junction; but far above. Its fountains according to Homer, and the best Authors, were supposed to have been in Mount Ida: Εξ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων—Γρηνικός τε καὶ Αἰσηπός, διος τε Σκαμανδρός. M. v. 19. Yet contrary to the express authority of the Poet he places the source of it in the plain beneath Bournarbachi; and makes the Simoïs the principal river; being misled by some lines of the Poet, which had been explained, but the explanation not thought worthy of notice.

In what part of the plain this junction of the two streams was effected, may be easily known: and will be found to have been high up near the City. For it is said of the two Goddesses, Juno and Minerva, that they arrived at Troy, where the two streams united. Τροίην ἴξον, ἥχι ῥόας Σιμοίς συμπάλλετον, ἠδὲ Σκαμανδρός. Il. E. v. 773. The Author should have considered this evidence, before he copied the Map of his Friend, which seems to be the most ill constructed and inaccurate, that ever was devised. He has indeed made a junction of the two rivers: but this junction is below, near the coast, and parallel to it: and far removed from the City, and the scene of action. It is

is effected by his arbitrarily forming in his Map a ditch, or canal, (call it which you please) and this the Author has too readily adopted : and styles it, *Amnis navigabilis Plinii*, 78. Yet not only Homer, as we have seen, but the Author himself says, that *the battle was fought below the confluence*. p. 88. line ult. Again---*In the 21st. Book, the battle was below the junction*. p. 89. line 20. Yet in contradiction to his own evidence he has placed the scene of action above, and made the junction below.

In short, he has been led into an error, and has made the Simois the principal river : as may be seen in his Map. He therefore labours to give it the pre-eminence, and to lower the character of the other river : though he confesses, that it was called *δινηεις, μεγας ποταμος, βαθυδινης*. To shew the superiority of the Simois he quotes (p. 88.) some lines from Homer, where he says, *the River Xanthus calls on his Ally, the Simois, upon a particular occasion*.

—————Haste, my Brother flood,
And check this mortal, who controuls a God,
Call then your subject streams, and bid them roar,
From all your fountains, swell your watry store.
With broken rocks, and with a load of dead,
Charge the black surge, and pour it on his head.

In consequence of this he tells us—*The Simois is characterised, as a violent, unequal, mountain torrent, rolling down in his “ black surge” stones, trees, and dead bodies*. This is very plausible. But when we apply to the

the

the original, to which he should have applied, we find not the least intimation of a *mountain torrent*, nor of *broken rocks*, nor *load of dead*; nor of *this black surge*. See. IL. Φ. v. 308. His giving the name of Xanthus to the former River in this place, shews, that he has been misled by Mr. Pope's translation: for in the original, v. 305, it is the Scamander. And the character given to the Simoïs is only occasional, and described upon a particular event.

And as he has tried to enhance the character of the Simoïs, so he tries to lessen that of the other river. He accordingly tells us, *the Scamander is pointed out as a clear, beautiful and perennial stream*, p. 88. What a very inadequate, and unfair description this is of the river; and how contrary to the character to be found in Homer? He owns it was called by the Poet ποταμος μεγας, δινηεις, βαθυδινης, yet represents it above, merely as *a clear, beautiful, and perennial stream*. And as the former epithets are very strong, and not easily to be made void, he endeavours to evade the force of them, by saying, (p. 87.) that they occur but *once, or twice, particularly in the 21st. Book*. How can a gentleman of character, liberal, I dare say, and ingenuous, condescend in this instance, to such poor and unworthy evasions? The river is represented as βαθυδινης and βαθυδινηεις, not less than six times in this very book. Also the terms βαθυρροος, λαβρος, ευρυ ρεων, and μεγας, are here repeatedly mentioned, and in many other places: whereas the name of the Simoïs occurs, I believe, not above seven times in the

twenty

twenty four Books of Homer; and never with any epithet. Yet this is the river, to which he has given the superiority.

The Author speaks with great contempt of Mr. B. for differing from him in respect to the situation of Troy. But Mr. B. is merely a neutral in this affair; and only shews the evidence of Homer, and other Writers in respect to the place in question. Hence he is induced to say, that the Camp of the Grecians was in a very different part of the region; and far distant from the marsh, near which the Author has placed it. Consequently neither the Simoïs, nor the Scamander, nor the City itself, were to be looked for there. He has been led, by good authorities, to suppose that the City Troy of Homer, was near Troas, and Mount Lectum, and in view of the Island Tenedos, to the south. The Author, on the contrary, p. 82, says, *It has been on all hands granted, that Troy was not here.* Yet in five lines afterwards he tells us, that Monsieur Belon, did not grant it, but insisted, that Troy was there: and the same opinion was held by Sandys, Lithgow, Gemelli, and others: also by Strabo; and even by Homer himself. The Author says, that neither of the two rivers can be found here. No: nor any where else: for they have been looked for but never truly determined, by the best Geographers of old. They differ greatly in their accounts of them. But, that nobody ever supposed, as the Author asserts, that the City and rivers were situated to the south, near Alexandria, and Lectum, is a mistake: for not only some of the moderns allowed it, as I have shewn, but also several of the

Ancients.

Ancients. Hierocles ranges the places downward in the following order. Abydus, Dardanum, Ilium, Troas, and the Scamander. p. 662. And we have seen that according to Strabo they come in the following manner. Abydus, Dardanus, Rhœteum, Sigeum, Portus Achivorum, Ostia, Scamandri, Lectum. L. 13. p. 891. Here is the very part of the Region to the south, where the river Scamander, according to these writers, must have run; and consequently where the City stood in their estimation; and according to the evidence of other Writers. And this situation was sometimes of old granted. And it was upon this account, that Lysimachus, and Antigonus, built Troas in memory of Troy; because they thought that the original City stood here or near it. Hesychius was of the same opinion, and places the City near Gargarus and Antandros, at the extremity of the Region of Troas. Γαργαρον, ακρωτηριον ορος Ιδης, και πολις Τροιας, πλησιον Αντανδρε.

We have hence another reason for supposing that Homer placed his City in these parts, as it was from this mountain, that he makes Jupiter take a view of it, as well as of the ships; and at the same behold the two armies, when engaged in battle. This could not have happened if the Camp and plain of Troy had been high to the north in the vicinity of Abydus. Lecton and Gargarus were two eminences of Mount Ida, and in the vicinity of each other: as may be seen from the history of the two Goddesses, who came to Lectum, where they for a while left Morpheus in the shape of an Owl; till Juno had prepared every thing for his reception on the top of Mount Gargarus.

II. E. v. 284. and v. 292. The Author will not allow this. On the contrary he insists, that Gargarus was 260 stadia, or about 30 miles from Lectum. p. 84. He is induced to make this computation from Strabo: by whom it is said, that after Lecton was a place called Poly-medium, at the distance of forty stadia: then a small grove upon the sea coast xc stadia beyond; and after an hundred and forty Gargara, Strabo, L. 13. p. 903. The Geographer here is speaking of places, with their distances in respect to one another, as they lay below Lecton, and near the sea. One of these was the City Gargara. But the *Ακρωτήριον*, or summit of that name, was, as has been above shewn, just above Mt. Lecton. This may be seen from the situation of the latter eminence. Strabo accordingly tells us, that it stood upon the verge of the sea, : and to the south below was the sinus Adramyttenus *καρψαντι τε το Λεκτον-----ο Αδραμυττηνος κολπος ενδεχεται*. The Author has been misled, and has supposed the number of stadia below Lectum, which amount in all 260 stadia in length, denoted the distance of Gargarus from Lectum. But if he had gone but one line farther, he would have found the true situation of this eminence, and would have perceived, that it was the highest part of Lectum; and that it stood at the extremity of the land, like Lectum, and upon the same bay of Adramyttium. *Κεῖται δὲ Γαργαρά ἐπ' ἀκρας ποίσεως τον ἰδίως Αδραμυττηνον καλυμμενον κολπον*. *The eminence called Gargara is situated upon that part of the promontory, which forms the Sinus Alramyttenus*. This very circumstance has just before been mentioned of Lectum; and
 below

below was Autandros, where Æneas is supposed to have built his ships. And Hesychius has told us----*πολις Τροίας πλησίων Αντανδρῶν*: *near this same Autandros was Troy*. Hence it is manifest, that Gargarus was in some degree the same as Lectum, being a part of it, and the *ακρωτηριον* or summit. When therefore the Author says Gargarus was 30 miles from Lectum, he is just 30 miles beyond his mark. Some may perhaps say, that the Gargara mentioned above, was the city of that name; but still the city points out the mountain near which it stood, and from which it was denominated. No mistake in situation can hence ensue. Macrobius places the city towards the bottom of the mountain Gargara-----*cacumen Montis Idæ, et oppidum sub eodem monte*. Satum. L. v. C. xx. P. 364.

In order to lessen the authority of Strabo, the Author insists without any evidence, that he got the whole account from Demetrius of Scepsis, (p. 111.) and he says, p. 35. that *there are good grounds for believing that he (Strabo) never was in the Troad*. That Strabo had not visited the Troad in person is certain, p. 71. These things are introduced more than once, but what the grounds were, upon which the Author built his opinion, he never sufficiently declares, nor was it in his power. Now let us attend to what Strabo affirm concerning himself. He accordingly tells us, that *he personally visited all the countries from Armenia westward, as far as Hetruria*. L. 2. p. 177. D. And he adds, that he believes no Geographer at any time went over so many of the regions, which he described. How then are we to determine in this

case? Strabo ait: Morrittus negat. Utri creditis, Quirites? The question will not admit of a moments consideration. The Author, in making Strabo so much beholden to Demetrius did not consider, instead of lowering his authority, how much he increased it to the ruin of his own purpose. For as Strabo was of Amasia in Asia Minor, he had the best opportunities of getting intelligence concerning the places in that part of the world. And when he travelled westward towards Greece and Italy, as the common place of passage was at Abydus we, may well suppose, that he stopped at that city, which by some is included in the region of Troas. And it surely cannot be thought any great presumption, if we should take for granted, that as a diligent Geographer he visited Ilium, and Troas itself; and the places in their vicinity, when he was so very near. Few therefore could be better judges of this part of the world than Strabo. If then to this experience we add the information he obtained from the writings of Demetrius, who had been a native of this country, and lived within a very few miles of the Ilienses: where is it possible to meet with better authority? Whoever will read the account given by him of the region Troas, will find that he speaks of himself as an eye witness almost in every line. It is therefore in vain to depreciate Strabo, and to make light of his evidence.

The Author takes notice of the Erineos or fig-tree, together with some other objects, mentioned by Homer, as near Troy: and he has determined their situation, so as to make them according to his fancy correspond

correspond with the City. But as his determination of the city is certainly wrong, their situation cannot be right. If the Gnomon be faulty, every line from it must be in a wrong direction. The reader will therefore excuse me, if I say nothing of the pretended Callicolone, the tomb of Ilus, the tomb of Myrina, or of the Scæan gate : and if I pass over the arguments used in describing them. These objects are mentioned by Strabo, but placed in a very different situation, and nothing certain can be determined about them.

The Author certainly has been hurried away by too great zeal; and dealt in a very inconclusive mode of reasoning. He took a Treatise before him, and began from the first page onward to object to every article. From the very outset he betrays a very hostile disposition; however he may disavow it. We find him pursuing every vague idea, which like an ignis fatuus plays before him : not once considering into what mazes it may lead him. It was thought strange, that the Poet should place Jupiter to the south upon Mount Gargarus, if he was to view *Τρωων τε πολλιν και νηας Αχαιων*, which according to the Author's position must have been thirty, or as some have thought, forty miles from that eminence. This objection the Author (p. 85.) tries to obviate. He says, *If human eyes could see the altar of Læctum from Ilium, much more could those of Jupiter view Ilium from Gargarus; a less distance from a higher summit.* We here find, that the Author, who gave credit to the fable of the wooden horse, has an equal belief in Jupiter, and his superior faculty of sight. And because I do not shew that

deference

deference to Jupiter, or to his optics, he accuses me of a *short-sighted system*. (p. 86.) But in effecting all this he tries to lessen the difficulty by an improper statement of the distance. In the first place Gargarus was not at a less distance; and there was nothing said about Ilium in the passage by Homer: but the ultimate of Jupiter's view was the city *και νηες Αχαιων*, and the *Grecian ships*, which according to his own position were a great way beyond Ilium. The situation of this place we learn also from Strabo. L. 13. p. 902. He therefore seems after all to entertain some doubts concerning the extent of Jupiter's vision; and by contracting the distance he thinks to make it more plausible. He accordingly directs his view to a nearer object. But this evasion is not ingenuous; and I am sorry the Author would submit to it, though in favour of Jupiter.

The Author often intimates, that there is a great absurdity in transferring *Troy to Egypt*: an article, which was never supposed. The contrary is the truth, for it was mentioned as a probability, that Troy in Egypt might have been in the Poem transferred to Phrygia, and that it was even then an ideal place; and never existed. The Author thinks that he puts a difficult question: and asks, *where will you find Ilium in Egypt?* (p. 77.) Nobody ever entertained so idle a notion; nor is it necessary to suppose it. At the same time he is not aware, that he may be asked,—*where will you find Ilium at Bounarbachî?* It is not to be met with there, nor ever was: for it stood several miles below: and Pergamum, the supposed Citadel, was still farther off, and in a different

different country. The situation therefore of Troy, if this be the test, could never have been, where he has chosen to place it, (p. 92.) His argument militates against himself. He still insists, that it could not have been to the south, near Troas; for no Simoïs or Scamander are to found in these parts. This may be true: for they have been sought after, as I have before said, by many Writers, but were never uniformly determined: no, not by Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy, or Antoninus, But still, if we believe the Poet, his Troy was here. He makes Gargarus thirty miles nearer the city than Lectum was, from a passage in Strabo, which he has totally mistaken. See Strabo, L. 13. p. 903.

There is at the end of the Author's Treatise a list of the Writers, who believed in the history of Troy, as described by Homer: and who supposed the City to have existed in Phrygia. These amount in number to near fifty. If to this collection there were to be added five thousand, or fifty thousand, it would not affect my argument. I believe, there were very few persons in all Hellas, that did not afford it in some degree, credit. But the same persons afforded a like belief to the wars of the Giants and Titans: and to other strange traditions. Error is sometimes systematic; and universally admitted in large bodies of people. The Metempsychosis is at this day religiously believed by Nations of great extent in the East. Many are persuaded that the soul of their Grandsire may be in an ape, or an Ass. But however popular and extensive this notion is now, or may have been for ages, the Author I trust, will never adopt their opinion.

Towards

Towards the end of the Vindication there is a very unexpected compliment introduced; and mention is made of the *well deserved fame* of Mr. B. p. 123. If this be true, how came the Author to endeavour to ruin that fame by the most severe, unmerited, and unjust censures? Why has he accused him of ignorance, absurdity, and futility? of false quotations, unfair translations, and wilful deviation from the truth? And this not once, but repeatedly. His name is mentioned above an hundred times, and generally with some sneer, and with the most sovereign contempt. The Reader is applied to continually to take warning, how he trusts a person, on whose word there is no reliance: who perverts, what he takes in hand, and abuses shamefully the authorities to which he refers. This person of *well deserved fame* is represented as full of low cunning and treachery; of carrying on a vile hypothesis, which he tries to support by the worst means. Why does not the Author look upon the character of another, as an object too sacred to be trifled with; and not found his own fame upon the ruin of his neighbours? Why has he not shewn more regard for his own character: for however fair, it must suffer from that undeserved censure and contempt, which he too wantonly discloses. As to this severity towards me, it amounts to nothing; I turn my back upon it as I would do to an eastern blight; and shelter myself easily from the noxious vapour. And while I ruminate upon these things, I think, I hear a friendly spirit say, *be at ease, and may all that rise against thee to do thee hurt, be as that young man, 2. Samuel. C. 18. v. 32.*

As the Author is a gentleman of learning, He may hereafter be of service to his Country by his influence and writings. If therefore I might at my time of day presume to give advice, I would recommend to him more care and caution in his mode of reasoning: that He may not give way to every flimsy and inconclusive argument which fancy suggests. I have shewn, that he pronounces it a misfortune *to trust to old established truths*, even of *undoubted authority*: whereas the assent is rational; and the opportunity a blessing. He likewise has thought it a misfortune (for so it is still intimated) to trust to those, who *know better than ourselves*: which however he says, is *not irrational*: it is therefore according to him a misfortune to act *not irrationally*, or in other words, according to right reason. I would likewise recommend to him not to indulge in a specious, but intricate flow of words: and in too florid, but embarrassed, diction. He should remember, that flowering shrubs bear little or no fruit. A composition of this kind is like the gawdy colours in an Indian screen. They may at first glance be a little noticed: but are seldom looked at a second time. Take for an example, what follows after the misfortunes above mentioned. p. 1.----*Yet this very circumstance, by which truth extends the frontiers of her empire, greatly weakens her internal powers of defence, and lulled into security by the number of her adherents she is too often unprepared to ward off the attacks against her person at home. In the present instance, Mr. B has afforded us a striking proof of this assertion.* What this proof is, I do not see: nor did I ever read any thing so

refined, figurative, and so incomprehensible. We expect fruit but find nothing but flowers. Our feelings are like those of some Indians, when they were treated with a bowl of whipt-syllabub. Each took a portion: but stood with open mouths and looks of amazement; for when they expected something solid, they found nothing but inanity. I would farther request of him not to betray himself, and shew, that he was not upon the spot, by referring to the Map of another person: and at the same time prove the insufficiency of his own by that reference. He says, that his Friend's Chart is very accurate. How came he then in many respects to differ so often from it: as may be seen by comparing? I fear, they were both the work of fancy: or at least the offspring of a remote and uncertain recollection. That the description of the region afforded by Mr. Chevalier does not quite merit the character given to it by his Friend, may I think be seen from an account afforded us in the British Critic: October, 1798. p. 447. In this is mentioned a letter from Salonica: by which we are informed, that *the Chart of Mr. Chevalier was not formed upon the spot on geometrical principles, but from memory only.*

It is farther to be wished, that the Author, in the prosecution of his purpose, had not trifled about articles of little moment, such as *χωρη* and *χαίρω*; but had considered the principal arguments afforded, upon which the whole depends. These should not have been evaded, but obviated, if it were in his power. It is maintained by Mr. B. that the city Troy never existed in Phrygia; that the name was never
of

of old acknowledged by the natives. In the march of Xerxes through upper Pyrygia, Ilium and a people styled Ilienses are mentioned; but no Τροία, or Troja; no Trojani; nor region Troas. This was probably one reason, why Metrodorus of Lampsacus, and the great Philosopher Anaxagoras, both inhabitants of this region, insisted that the account of the war by Homer was a fable. The city celebrated by the Poet under the name of Troy is also called by him Ilium: and two places are described by Strabo of that name, which existed in his time. L. 13. p. 886. Here, if any where, we should expect to meet with Troy, but it was never to be found. Nor was there any district here, or place whatsoever, which had a reference to that name, till Antigonus and Lysimachus built Troas.

As there were two places which belonged to the Ilienses, in this part of the world; there was a dispute, which of them was the ancient Troy. Hellanicus gave it in favour of the city near the sea side; but Strabo adjudged it to the Pagus Iliensium, some miles above, L. 13. p. 898. This very debate shews that neither of the two had any pretensions. For if either of them had any just claim, the name of Troja, and some traditions of the siege, must have remained, upon which that claim would have been founded. But the natives of neither of these places could afford any such proof; otherwise the alternative would have been easily decided.

We find that many subordinate cities are mentioned in the course of

the Poem ; such as Sestus, Abydus, Dardanum, Lyrnessus, Larissa, Thebe, Chryse, Arisba, Percote, Miletus, Mycale : also the Islands Lesbos, and Tenedos ; and the mountains Gargarus, Lectum and Ida. It is strange that all these should have retained their names for ages afterwards, while the most celebrated place of all, Troy, was not had in remembrance ; nor the region of Troy ever mentioned. We are told, that it was taken and destroyed. Arisba. Thebe, Chryse, and many of the cities above, underwent the same fate, and some of them repeatedly. If we trust to the authority of Homer, no less than twenty three cities in the vicinity of Troy, were taken by Achilles. *Il. I. v. 328.* How came those specified above to have been known, and identified afterwards : and the most remarkable of all, upon which Homer had impressed a sanction, to have been totally obliterated ? how many cities have been sacked, and more than once ruined ; yet have risen again, and preserved their name ? what is extraordinary, Ilium remained, and a people styled Ilienses ; but as I have before said, neither Troja, Troas, nor Trojani.

Some have thought, that the stones, and remains, of ancient Troy were carried away to repair Achilleum. Strabo, *L. 13. p. 896.* But, if these were the real ruins, the name of that City must have existed, by which those ruins were determined : and consequently its situation been known. But the disputes, which have at all times prevailed, shew the uncertainty of these notions. Besides, these stones, which were supposed to have been carried off, belonged to Ilium. This

was a city very different from Troy, and the Ilium of Homer, as Strabo, past contradiction, has shewn. The account therefore of these dilapidations, as Demetrius informs us, was a fiction. They were introduced, as an expedient to prove the situation of a city, which never existed. Had Troy ever stood in these parts, the Poem of Homer would have immortalized it. Neither the name, nor place, would have been forgotten. It was however never heard off, till the later Greeks, and the Romans after them, blindly introduced the name ; but did not know to what part to assign the city. And here it appears extraordinary, as both *Ιλιος*, and *Τροίη*, (Ilium, and Troja) are by Homer applied as names to the same city ; that the former should be retained, and the other (Troja), if this Ilium were that city, never occur. Above all, that the people should be solely distinguished by the appellations of *Ιλίες*, Ilienses, or Iliades, which never once occur in Homer ; and that the name *Τρώες* (or Trojani), which with its inflexions is to be found some hundred of times, should be totally lost. If Troy had existed, and was to be found in Ilium ; and had these Ilienses been the descendants of the ancient Trojans ; the authority of the Poet would have prevented that title being ever annihilated. The natives would have been proud of being denominated from such Ancestors.

I could have wished therefore, that the Author of the Vindication, had considered more carefully these articles, and others of the like consequence ; and the arguments deduced from them. Instead of this he has often amused himself in objecting, when there was no opposition,

opposition, and proving what was never denied: that Ilium and Odusseus (p. 33.) were never removed to Egypt; and that Scepsis and Cebrenia were not to be found upon the Nile. p. 44. I assent fully, and I farther believe, that there was no Mount Gargarus at Memphis, nor Ida at Thebes. But what is all this to the purpose? The system which he is pleased to controvert, depends not upon these trifling articles; but is founded upon a variety of arguments, and cannot be in the least affected, should one or two out of many be arraigned, as inconclusive. Yet some have thought, that if they could artfully undermine one pillar out of five hundred, the building must necessarily fall. But I trust, that it is too well supported.

The Author is a keen antagonist, but he should take care not to be in opposition to himself, and counteract his own purpose. This we saw happen, when he placed Troy on an eminence, bounded by the Scæan gate: and when he afterwards brought it down below on the wrong side of that gate, in contradiction to all that he had said just before. Hence if we look for the city in its primary situation, it is not to be found: and we may say of it, as a Poet says of modern Rome::

Et Romæ in Româ nil reperis mediâ.

Troy is run away from its self.

The Romans had as great a veneration for Homer, when they became acquainted with him, as the Grecians: and looked upon the war of Troy, as a true history. They went farther, and supposed, that Æneas
after

after that war came to Italy : and that they were descended from the Trojans. Bochart opposed this notion : and I never heard that he incurred any obloquy, or ill will, upon the occasion. He observes, that all Colonies, wherever they may settle, always retain some traits and resemblance of the people and Country, whence they came. He allows, that all the Roman Poets and Historians, from Nævius and Fabius Pictor down to Livy, and Dionysius Halicarnassensis, speak of it, and by many it was believed. Yet he contends, and very justly ---iter Æneæ in Italiam nullum habere fundamentum in rei veritate. vol. 1. p. 1077. The general opinion of Writers, all comparatively late, amounts to little : for where there is an Epidemic blindness, we may expect many to be affected. In respect to any traces of their Phrygian Ancestors he insists that none appear. And he accordingly with a wonderful profusion of learning gives an account of the language of the Phrygians, and their neighbours : also of their rites and Deities, of which not the least resemblance was to be found among the Romans. Æneas is made by Virgil to say---Sacra Deosque dabo : but nothing of this sort was afforded. Yet among the sacred articles, said to have been introduced, was the Palladium. This, when the Temple of Vesta was in flames, Metellus is reported at the hazard of his life to have rescued : and on that account had great honours conferred upon him. Yet this must have been a different Image : for the Grecians, and even Ovid, a Roman, maintained that the Palladium was stolen by Diomedes and Ulysses, before the City Troy was taken :
and

and it could never have returned into the hands of the Trojans. It is said to have been the image of the Goddess Pallas, which together with his Lares and Penates Æneas was supposed to have brought with him, when he landed.

Sum pius Æneas, raptos qui ex hoste Penates
Classe veho mecum.

Yet Varro affirms, that there were in early times no statues of the Deities: and this mode of adoration was not introduced till the 17th. year of Rome. Plutarch also tells us in the life of Numa, that the ancient people of Latium had no representations of Deities, either carved or painted. They insisted, that divine objects ought not to be described by things inferior; and that the Deity could not be conceived, but by internal contemplation. How then could the Palladium of Troy exist in the time of Metellus; especially, if it had long before been stolen by Diomedes and the Greeks?

This is also mentioned by Virgil, who speaks of this theft being committed by the persons above.

Tydides sed enim scelerumque inventor Ulysses,
Fatale aggressi sacrato avellere templo
Palladium. Æn. L. 2. v. 164.

In short there were no traces of Troy to be found in ancient Rome. All traditions antecedent to the building of the city, and long after
were

were dark and fabulous. This was the opinion of Livy. *Quæ ante conditam condendamve urbem, poeticis magis decora fabulis, quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis, traduntur: ea nec affirmare, nec refellere, in animo est. L. 1. C. 1.* Hence we may infer from this excellent Historian, that the fact was disputed; but that he would not venture to decide it. Could he have determined it in favour of the Romans, he would not have omitted the opportunity.

There is another article, of which the very learned Bochart, has not taken notice, though it appears of great consequence. It is extraordinary, that these supposed emigrants from Troy, should not have retained the name of the people, whence they came. We never find them of old styled Teucri, Troës, or Trojani; but on the contrary Latini. These were the people whom they are said to have conquered; and contrary to all rule and custom, to have assumed their name, *contra morem*, says le Cerda, as we may learn from the people of Africa; *victi omnes in gentem nomenque imperantium concessere.* Sallust. Jugurth. The conquered people may suffer a change: but there is scarcely an instance of the victors, immediately losing their national appellation, and taking the name of their vassals; so that no remains, no history of it, should be afterwards discovered.

Virgil thought proper to found his excellent Poem, upon a received opinion, that Æneas came to Latium from Phrygia, and brought a Colony of Trojans with him. But this notion was certainly controverted, as we may infer from Livy, quoted above: and more particu-

larly from Virgil himself. And the objection arose from there being no account of any people called Trojans, nor Teucri; nor of Ilienses, in the ancient traditions of the country; nor was there any reference to Troy. Yet they were supposed to have had a regular succession of kings. How was it then possible for them so soon to have lost sight of their original? Virgil must have been well acquainted with this objection, for he tries to obviate, what was brought in opposition to his system; but with what success the Reader must judge. He has recourse to the higher powers: and introduces Jupiter as insisting, that Juno should lay aside her inveteracy to the Trojans. She at last agrees, but upon condition, that the hateful name of *Troy*, and *Trojan*, should never more be admitted, and kept up by their posterity. She accordingly addresses Jupiter in these words.

Pro Latio obtestor, pro Majestate tuorum, &c.

Ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos,

Aut vocem mutare viros, aut vertere vestes.

Occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troja.

Æneidos. L. 12. 820, &c.

Jupiter assents to this, and adds among other things

Subsident Teucri: morem ritusque sacrorum

Adjiciam. v. 836.

We find, that he would do something more, and give them new rites and form of worship. Though we may not allow the means, yet we must admit the facts: and setting aside the interposition of these Deities, we learn, that the name of *Troy*, or of *Trojans*, was

not

not admitted among the ancient Latini. In other words, they were unknown to them: and all the rites, and religion, of the Phrygians, were equally unknown. Hence no traces of them are upon inquiry to be found. In consequence of this we may infer from the Poet, that some objections had been made in his time to the account given of Æneas; and to the pretensions of the Romans, who affected to be of Trojan original. To these objections, we may perceive, that Virgil, in the speech of Juno, makes a tacit reply. This is composed, and executed with much art and industry. But still in giving a reason for the deficiency, he allows the fact; which was, that no account of Troy, or Trojan, was to be found in their ancient traditions. Hence this short Corollary results: *It is impossible to believe, that a people settled, and ruled, in a Country, of whose name there was no original record.*

Many may think, that I have taken much unnecessary trouble: for whoever trusts to Homer, must know, that the Poet plainly asserts, that Æneas never left Troas; but, after the ruin of Priam and his family, he reigned over the Trojans there, and no where else: though some have thought otherwise. This is manifest from his words.

Ἢδη γὰρ Πριάμῃ γενεὴν ἡχθῆρε κρονίων.

Νυν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείας ἔσσι Τρώεσσιν ἀναξίει,

Καὶ παῖδες παίδων, τοὶ κεν μετοπίσθῃ γενώνται.

Il. γ. 306. See also v. 180.

We are here told, that the race of Priam were become obnoxious to Jupiter, and in his room, Æneas would reign over the people of

Troas. There was an alteration made in these verses, probably in the time of Augustus Cæsar, when for Τρωεσσιν there was artfully substituted πάντεσσιν. This was done, in order to countenance the Hypothesis of Virgil, that Æneas came to Italy, and that the Romans were descended from the Trojans. Strabo. L. 13. p. 906. The lines therefore in the Æneis corresponded with this reading.

Hic domus Æneæ cunctis dominabitur oris,

Et nati natorum, et qui nascentur ab illis. Æneid. L. 13. v. 97.

Hence, according to the lines above, Homer is made to announce the future grandeur of the Romans. But how could the Bard allude to this extent of Empire, who according to most accounts wrote before any Romans existed, and before their City was founded? It was a wretched expedient to countenance a fable; and soon became extinct. Bochart assures us, that there is not a printed copy of Homer, nor any manuscript now known in which this reading is to be found. In Mr. Pope's Translation, Book 20. v. 355. there are subjoined some observations upon this subject, well worth notice, which I recommend to the Reader.

If Æneas had ever come to Italy, we should have heard something of Venus, his reputed Mother, who was his tutelary Deity. Virgil mentions, that in Sicily, which was only a place of passage, he raised a temple to her honour.

Tum vicina astris Erycinò in vertice sedes

Fundatur Veneri Idaliæ. Æneid. L. v. v. 759.

But

But there was nothing of this sort in Italy, where he was, with his son and Colony, supposed to have settled. This is something extraordinary. We read in late times of Venus Genetrix, and Æneadum Mater; and Sanctuaries were built, and rites instituted, in consequence of her introduction: but to these, the ancient Romans were utterly strangers. The second month of the year, was thought to be denominated from her. Of these articles, the learned Bochart (v. 1. p. 1067.) takes notice. Si venisset pius Æneas ille in Italiam, sine dubio commendâset plurimum cultum Veneris, quam dicebat Matrem suam. Sed illius nullum vestigium in Româ veteri. He then observes from Macrobius, that some people thought that the month of April was so called from Venus Aphrodite; as the antecedent month was from Mars: and that it was by the appointment of Romulus. But the same Author tells us, that this was a great mistake; though at first he seems to favour the notion, that Æneas came to Italy. Huc usque dices eum (Macrobius) favere sententiæ, quâ Æneas dicitur venisse in Italiam. Sed quæ sequuntur, ea ipsa penitus subvertunt.—Cincius in eo libro, quem de Festis reliquit, ait, imperite quosdam opinari, Aprilem Mensem Antiquos a Venere dixisse; cum nullus dies festus, nullumque sacrificium insigne, Veneri per hunc mensem a majoribus institutum sit: sed ne in carminibus quidem Saliorum Veneris ulla, ut cæterorum Cælestium, laus celebretur. Cincio etiam Varro consentit, affirmans, nomen Veneris ne sub Regibus quidem apud Romanos vel Latinum vel Græcum fuisse: et ideo non potuisse mensem a Venere nominari. Macrob.

L. i. p. 170. This passage is not now to be found in Varro; but there is another passage still extant; in which that Author very justly blames those, who would derive the month Aprilis from Aphrodite, the Grecian name of Venus; for her name no where occurred, in any ancient memorials of the Romans.—Cujus nomen ego antiqueis littereis quod nusquam inveni, magis puto dictum, quod ver omnia aperit, Aprilem. Varro de Ling. Lat. Amotel. p. 50. By this is meant, that Aprilis is quasi Aperilis, and so called, because in this month blossoms and fruits begin to open themselves. April therefore was by no means derived from Venus Αφροδιτη; for we find, that her name of old was utterly unknown to the Romans. But this could not possibly have happened, if Æneas had ever come to Latium. See Bochart. Vol. i. p. 1067.

Some may perhaps think, that the Ludus Troja, or Trojanus, is a proof, that the Romans came originally from Troy. But upon consideration we shall find, that no such inference can be made. This exercise is indeed described by Virgil, as performed by some young persons of Troy during their residence in Sicily. These under the guidance of Iulus, go through all the intricate evolutions of Hussars, or other light Horsemen of these times. This, if we consider, that they had been wandering for the most part on the seas, must seem extraordinary. It is true, Virgil represents Iulus, some short time antecedent, upon a fiery steed, and wishing to engage a lion; forgetting that a night or two before, he introduced him, or Cupid under his semblance,

semblance, as a child, whom Dido took to her bosom,—*interdum gremio fovet*. Soon after, he is farther described in Italy at a council of war at midnight; at which time he presents Euryalus with a warrior's sword.—*mirâ, quem fecerat arte Lycaon Cnossius. Æneid. ix. v. 304.* This he took off from his shoulders, and gave him when he was going upon a dangerous expedition. These articles were all within the compass of a few months; and it may be worth while to know, at what age he performed these achievements. This may be with tolerable exactness made out; for Andromache says, that her son Astyanax would have been just as old.

Sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat,

Et nunc æquali tecum pubesceret ævo. Æneid. L. 3. v. 490.

Now Astyanax was an infant in his nurse's arms, just before his father's death, and the ruin of Troy: and the events above, were six years inclusive afterwards. For Dido tells Æneas---*te septima portat ætas*. And when they were in Sicily, it is farther said—*Septima post Trojæ excidium jam vertitur ætas. L. v. v. 626.* Iulus therefore could be but ¹ seven years, or seven years and a half old, when he was riding a fiery horse; when he was assisting at a council of war at night, at which time he gave his sword, not one of lath, but a warrior's sword, to Euryalus: when he is also described upon the rampart, drawing his bow, and killing

¹ Livy speaks of him, after his father's death, as still impuber—*nondum maturus imperio*: and under the tuition of a woman. L. 1. C. 3. P. 12.—Varior. This was between three and four years after his appearance in Sicily.

Fortem Numanum, the Hero Numanus Remulus. *Æneid*. L. ix. v. 663. Lastly, this was his age, when he performed these feats of horsemanship, in the Ludus Troja: and this at an æra, when we are told, that the use of Cavalry in war was not yet known. Virgil with all his superlative excellence certainly sometimes forgets himself: and when it is said, interdum bonus dormitat Homerus, we may fairly add, interdum nutat et ipse Maro. This I have mentioned to shew, that there is no dependence upon Virgil, concerning this custom. It seems to have been an imitation of the Βηταρμος, or Pyrrhic dance, which was particularly practised in Crete, and generally by young persons. It took its rise probably among the Romans, when they first began to be acquainted with the Grecians; and at the time when the story about Æneas, and the worship of Venus, were introduced. The first celebration of it, that occurs in history, was, I believe, in the time of Sylla. Plutarch. Cato. p. 706. Nothing therefore can be inferred from the Ludus Trojanus, concerning the origin of the Romans. It would be idle to suppose, because a person in these days, practised the Louvre, or Allemand, or a Morisco dance, that he was of France, or Germany, any more than of Fez or Algiers. The usage of the Prussian exercise will never make Sergeant Kite a Brandenburgher. We may find some very good Observations upon this head, made by Professor Heyne, in his Edition of Virgil, vol. 2. Excursus V. p. 62. But the fullest account is given by my very learned friend, Doctor G. H. Noehden, in a Commentary upon Virgil,

by

by him published at Brunswic 1794. vol. 1. p. 332. He has, I believe, omitted no Greek or Roman Author, from whom any intelligence can be obtained. Hence we have afforded us an opening to very curious information.

It seems extraordinary, as I have before taken notice, that people should be so very solicitous about the reputation of Homer, when it was not in the least danger. For in the estimation of the world a Poet's character does not depend upon the truth of his subject, but upon the execution of his work. There was therefore no occasion to write a Vindication of Homer, for there had been nothing hinted to his disparagement. Not the least evil accrued, though I ventured to substitute an apologue instead of a supposed truth, or to have removed the scene to another region. I believe few have shewn a greater regard for the Poet's honour, or placed his excellence in a fairer light. Those who will not allow the Ilias to be a fable, yet own that it abounds with stories of Gods, and Demi-Gods; also with many supernatural events, and strange occurrences; which by every reasonable and impartial person must be given up; and they are accordingly so acknowledged. In consequence of this, those who insist upon the authenticity of the history, are obliged to make great defalcations; and to divest the poem of many spurious ornaments. Hence it looks like a tree, stript of its leaves and branches; nothing but the bare stem appears,—*trunco, non frondibus efficit umbram*. This in great measure is allowed by the Author of the Vindication: but he asserts,

that whatever improbabilities there may be, they do not impeach the credibility of the history. But this is a great mistake ; for the truth of any history must be more or less doubted, in proportion to these incredible articles. What should have been said, is this, that they do not affect the Poet. On the contrary, if they are well conducted, they add to his reputation. The whole being a figment will not prove any obstacle. The Poem of the Fairy Queen is an allegory ; and the history of La Mancha's Knight is a fiction. Yet did either Spencer or Cervantes suffer in their character ? or was the reputation of their works diminished ? Why then are we so blindly solicitous about the truth of any poetical work, if it was designed to be a fable ? Many fictions serve to illustrate the subject matter, and to lead to truths in disguise. If we admit nothing, but what is literally true, all tropes and metaphors must be given up : and analogy laid aside. The greatest beauties, and most useful ornaments in writing must be sacrificed. Let then the war of Troy be either real or feigned ; to what does it amount ? The Ilias will in all respects be the same, and its excellence unimpaired.

But it is objected, that I have supposed, that it originated in Egypt. Something to this purpose has been laid before the Reader ; but nothing determined. But if it were true, the same conclusions would follow ; as the Poem would be the same, from whatever quarter it came. If we possess a salutary fruit, or uncommon species of flower, why are we over solicitous about its native region, or climate ? And if a
 person

person should be so indiscrete, as to say, that it came from the Desert of Zara, or the snows of Greenland: still be not too much offended; nor give way to extravagant censure, and contemptuous ill-will. Mix a little compassion with your severity, and thank Heaven that you are better informed. To what obloquy have some people been exposed, because they ventured to engage in an innocent inquiry! There has been an outcry on all sides; that the whole of ancient history was in danger. It was, they say, a great presumption to move such a question.

Μη κινειν Καμαριναν, ακινητος γαρ αμεινων.

Yet such questions have been agitated; and no evil has ensued. We know, that the popular story of Regulus, and of his return to Carthage, is mentioned by Silius Italicus, and likewise by Horace, and recorded, as true. Yet whoever reads Palmerius, will find good reason to doubt it. The whole history of the Trojan War is by Monsr. Paschal set aside as a fable. And the evidence of Paschal is of no small consequence. *Homer wrote a Romance: for nobody can believe, that Troy and Agamemnon had any more existence, than the golden apple. He had no intention to write a history, but merely to amuse us.* See the Anecdotes of distinguished Persons, by W. Seward Esqr. Supplement. p. 249.

Every body knows the excellence of Monsr. Paschal, of whom Bayle, and many other respectable Writers, speak with the highest veneration. Hence I am not the only person even of the Moderns, who have esteemed the war of Troy a fable. I have the countenance of some of the

But it is still said, if this war is doubted, to what can we trust? I answer, to every history, which is better authenticated; to the history of the siege of Tyre, and of Carthage; also of Saguntum. We may give credit to the Histories of Hannibal, and the Scipios; of Pompey, and Lucullus; of Cato, and of Cæsar; in preference to any history of the son of Venus, or of Thetis; of Jupiter, Neptune, or Vulcan. Besides, the dispute about this City in Phrygia is not merely, at what time it existed, or where: but whether it could possibly have existed: for the nature of the Country is such, that the best Geographers could never ascertain its position. Strabo thought, that there was a part of the region near Achæum, where it might have stood. But this was only opinion. The Natives had no tradition about it: nor was the name of Troy known there. Mr. Chevalier, as we have seen, has placed it upon a hill inland; and the Author of the Vindication follows him. But he ultimately differs from him, and differs from himself; and is at variance with Homer, and all the world beside. Still the alarm has been so great, that it has been said: *Our holy Religion is hazarded; and our faith in danger.* But surely their faith must be very lukewarm, that can be affected by the tale of a wooden Horse, and a Phrygian Borough. And they do not consider the injury which they do to Religion, as well as the dishonour,

wisest Men of antiquity: and I have mentioned, among others, the name of Anaxagoras; who has been treated with so much contempt. It was through him, that such improvements were made in religious philosophy: for he added *us*, or divine Intellect to matter: which before was thought, not only to be eternal, but the universal cause of Beings.

by making it depend upon such foreign and precarious objects. I little thought, that by demolishing Babel, I should injure the Holy City: or by pulling down a Pagoda, ruin the Church.

Another argument to which many have applied, and of which I have taken some notice before, is founded on the authority of Thucydides. He believed the history of this war to be true, and gave it his sanction. *How is it possible, they say, to oppose such evidence?* He was certainly a most excellent Historian: yet we may reasonably suppose, that like Socrates, Plato, Solon, and other Philosophers, of Greece, he had his share of credulity; and believed, as they did, in the traditions of his Country. Where they all abounded, we cannot suppose him to have been exempt. If then we were to assent to any strange articles, which they believed, it would be difficult to know where to stop. We must give credit to the story of the Hydra, and of brazen bulls; also of Cerberus, and Typhæus; and the war of the Gods. The history of their first kings also must be received, as it was implicitly believed by them. Such was Cecrops δῆφους, and the serpentine Erichthonius, proles sine matre creata; together with numberless metamorphoses, and idle fables, with which their mythology and histories are filled. The rape of Ganymede, the conflagration of Phaëton, the rape of Proserpine, and wandering of Ceres; the history of Argus πανοπτῆς; the fable of the Cow Iö; and the ἀποθῆωσις of Hercules, were looked upon as indisputable facts, and admitted into their Chronology. They were referred to in their calculations; and the

the times of other events were determined by them. This we learn by the accounts transmitted from Thallus, Philochorus, Eratosthenes, and other Chronologists, mentioned by Tatianus, Theophilus, Clemens, and from the Parian Marbles still extant. The most incredible stories were looked upon as sacred truths; and they raised altars, and performed religious rites in consequence of this belief. Hence these traditions were not only credited by Palæphatus, Phurnutus, and Antoninus Liberalis; but by Pliny, Pausanias, and the sage Plutarch; and long before, by Solon, Socrates, Plato, and other Philosophers of ancient date. We must not therefore conclude, that a history must necessarily be genuine, because they believed it; for they were credulous to the last degree. Other reasons must be assigned for a just assent, if any such can be obtained. Their authority in such instances, cannot be deemed sufficient: for they believed more or less the greatest absurdities. I say, more or less, for they were not strictly uniform in their degree of faith. Thucydides may be observed at times to speak with some diffidence, and not to place an intire confidence in Homer. 'He doubts in some instances, whether the Poet is to be trusted: *εἰ τῷ Ἰάνος τεκμηριώσαι*; again, *τῇ Ὀμήρῳ αὖ ποιήσει εἰ τι χρηρὲς αἰσέειν*. L. 1. C. 9. p. 9. C. 10. p. 10.

It has been mentioned, that this subject upon which I had before written, had been considered by me for a great many years. And I had collected many memorials from a variety of Authors, and to a large amount, concerning the life of the Poet, and the history of his

his family. These memorials seemed to be curious, and at the same time not very obvious. But the Author tells us, *that all that I have said is conjecture, and of no weight. And notwithstanding my erudition, my authority on this subject is on a level with that of the most ignorant.* p. 31. This is very decisive, and determinate: and the Author sets off to great advantage the opinion, which he entertains of his own superiority. I shall not therefore, whatever erudition He may please to allow me, venture to reply; but will timely withdraw myself from so unequal a conflict. But before I quit the field intirely, I beg to hint to the Author, that however conscious he may be, of his parts and powers, there are many inaccuracies, and mistakes still remaining in the Treatise, which I have been obliged to oppose. But as I am led to believe, that I have proved my innocence in respect to many severe articles of censure, preferred against me, I shall rest contented with having performed the duty, which I owed to my character; and omit every thing, which that duty does not require. Nor should I perhaps have made any reply to the Treatise above mentioned, had it not contained some popular arguments, which have been elsewhere used upon the occasion. Hence by replying to one, I give an answer to all. I had likewise another reason, which has always been prevalent in these researches, wherein I have at all controverted the early histories of Greece. It seemed to me, that, if I shewed the obscurity, uncertainty, and inconsistency, of these histories,

histories, I should tacitly recommend the History, of all others, the most ancient, and most excellent ; and shew its superiority.

C. O N C L U S I O N.

Thus much I thought proper to say in my justification, in order to shew that my purpose was good ; and at the same time to take off all undue alarm. I shall now venture to conclude with this aphorism, *That the detection of error can never be the bane of truth.*

Parcite, propositum legitis quicunque libellum,
Si temerè opposui memet juvenilibus armis,
Lassatusque annis, et longo debilis ævo.
Sed tamen, ut Summi voluit clementia Patris,
Non vigor omnis abest ; virtus neque pristina cessit.



ERRATA.

- Page 7. l. 13. *dele* that.
 15. l. 11. *read* εἰπουσι.
 22. l. 11. follows.
 26. l. 18. keenness.
 32. l. 20. hic Jupiter. p. 10.
 for hoc numen
 Spartæ, p. 12.
 33. l. 4. p. 141.
 38. bottom. you *for* ye.
 43. l. 19 & 21. lose.
 45. l. 10. Chieftains.
 51. l. 8. Achivorum.
 56. l. 20. Chersonese.
 58. l. 21. protrusion.
 61. l. 12. Bounarbachi.
 65. l. 5. Ostia Scamandri.
 l. 17. same time.
 66. l. 11. Mt. Lecton.
 16. to 260.
 67. l. 12. Saturn.
 68. l. 1. negat.
 5. For, as.
 8. Abydus, we.
 69. l. 13. vague.
 74. l. 17. geometrical.
 75. l. 2. Phrygia.
 83. l. 19. Κρονίω.
 86. l. 7. Amstel.
 91. l. 2. Zaara.

Special 90-B
15413

Special

90-B 15413

Bound w/

90-B 15417

90-B 15419

90-B 15421

90-B 15424

90-B 15422

90-B 15425

